3 1761 11970131 6

AR3733



Presented to
The Library
of the
University of Toronto
by

James Stewart, Esq.

Government
Publications

CA1 Z1
-55C21

Canada. Royal commission on broadcasting.
Hearings. v. 9-12, 1956.

1957


Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2023 with funding from
University of Toronto

https://archive.org/details/31761119701316

9

ROYAL COMMISSION

ON

BROADCASTING

HEARINGS

HELD AT

REGINA, SASK. MAY 11, 1956

v.9

ROYAL COMMISSION ON BROADCASTING

Hearings of the Commission held at the legislative building in Regina, Saskatchewan, commencing at 10 a.m., Friday May 11, 1956

.....

PRESENT:

THE CHAIRMAN	ROBERT M. FOWLER
COMMISSIONER	EDMOND TURCOTTE
COMMISSIONER	JAMES STEWART

.....

COMMISSION COUNSEL	JOHN M. COYNE
	A.J. deGRANDPRE

.....

SECRETARY	PAUL PELLETIER

.....

APPEARANCE:

SASKATCHEWAN DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION	MISS GERTRUDE MURRAY SUPERVISOR OF SCHOOL BROADCASTS
	MR. HENRY JANZEN DIRECTOR OF CURRICULA
CANADIAN FEDERATION OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN	MISS MARION GILROY, CONVENER? LIBRARIES AND CREATIVE ARTS COMMITTEE
SASKATCHEWAN ARTS BOARD	MRS. L.L. ODDIE, VICE CHAIRMAN
	MR. S.S. BOYLING
	MR. K.G. ABERDEEN

BOTHWELL HILL COMPANY	G.R. BOTHWELL
ASSOCIATION CATHOLIQE FRANCE CANADIENNE DE LA SASKATCHEWAN	M.DUPONT LEPAGE PRESIDENT GENERAL
RADIO-GRAVELBOURG LIMITEE	DR. ROSARIO MORIN, PRESIDENT
	M.DUPONT LESAGE, SECRETAIRE
LABOUR-PROGRESSIVE PARTY SASKATCHEWAN COMMITTEE	MRS. NELSON CLARKE
SASKATCHEWAN WHEAT POOL	B.W. ROBERTSON, SECRETARY
	A.R. STEVENS, ASSISTANT SECRETARY

.....

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, we will open the sittings of this Commission at Regina. We are very glad indeed to be here. It looks from the briefs we have received that we will have an interesting day, and we greatly appreciate the interest that has been taken by those who have prepared and are going to present briefs. I may just say a word or two about our procedure. All the briefs having been received; we have read them and given them some study. We will be glad to have them presented and at least the high points summarized for us. In the case of the short briefs if you wish to read them through that is all right but we really want to get on, if possible, to the questioning.

On this matter of questioning I should perhaps repeat something which I said

at the openings of the public hearings in Ottawa, that we are here to try, both here and in other sittings, and get all the facts, and weight up the various opinions, and therefore we have been proceeding on the basis of asking questions. I did in Ottawa make the statement that no one should read into any questions any opinion or view that the Commission holds. It has not always worked out that way, because I noticed when we were in Winnipeg one of the headlines spoke of us favouring this or that policy by reason of the way in which questions were addressed. I just want everyone to understand the Commission has reached no conclusions, and will not do so, until it has heard all the facts, and got all the facts it can. Therefore, if we are questioning we will necessarily be questioning to some extent from the opposite point of view so as to bring out the facts and the opinions, and make sure that those opinions that have been expressed have been weighed against the background of certain facts, which should be kept in mind. So, with that introduction as to our procedure I think we will begin with the first brief, which is from the Saskatchewan Department of Education.

APPEARANCE:

SASKATCHEWAN DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION	MISS G. MURRAY MR. H. JANZEN

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand, Miss Murray, you are going to present that brief, and you have with you Mr. Janzen, the Director of Curricula. You are the supervisor of school broadcasts, Miss Murray?

MISS MURRAY: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will begin by filing your brief as Exhibit 58.

EXHIBIT "58": Brief presented by Saskatchewan Department of Education.

MR. JANZEN: Mr. Chairman, and members of the Commission: On behalf of the Department of Education, I should like to present this brief to you, and we are asking Miss Murray to speak to the brief. She is the one who has been very closely in touch with broadcasting in schools, dealing with these matters for many years, and she is also on the Council that has been planning these school telecasts, and we feel she is the person who ought to speak to the brief, and I should like to present Miss Murray to the Commission.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Janzen, and please feel perfectly free to make any comments you wish throughout and answer any questions as well as Miss Murray.

MISS MURRAY: Mr. Chairman, and members of the commission, I would like to present a summary of the brief we submitted from the School Broadcasts Branch of the Department of Education.

As a Department with special interest in the educational use of radio and television, we have some specific points in mind.

First, the brief indicates that this province joined with the other provinces of Canada and the C.B.C. in the formation of the National Council on School Broadcasting. The policy developed by this Council is supported wholeheartedly. We sincerely appreciate the contribution the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has made to the development of School Broadcasts. We also appreciate the contribution made by private stations who have assisted through the provision of network facilities. Because co-operation was forthcoming, it has been possible for the province to develop the use of classroom radio. We are aware that the development of a purely provincial system of school broadcasting would have been very difficult financially. By each assuming a share of costs and responsibilities, there has been a gratifying growth in the past thirteen years.

By now this province has a considerable investment in the audio-visual field. Some 3,100 schools are equipped with radios. We feel that we must take this opportunity to assure them that the work of this Branch will be carefully considered should any change be made in broadcasting services. This investment has been made by individual schools,

school unit boards, and the Department of Education. It is being increased yearly. The investment also covers the cost of maintaining and operating a School Broadcasts Branch within the Department of Education. In the Brief, we have indicated the extent of the work carried on in the Branch and the contact that is maintained with the listening schools.

To make the fullest juse of educational radio as it is now carried on, we have some specific needs which we feel this Commission will want to consider. The first is that of adequate coverage within the province. We have indicated that we require province-wide coverage. This means that we continue to depend on the co-operation of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and the private stations. We have indicated the coverage we had in 1945. It has changed considerably since then. At that time, our broadcasts were carried by five private stations. This was the period during which most of the city schools were building up their supply of radio equipment. In most cases, the city schools listened through their local radio station. In 1946, CBK Watrous was added and we had a network of six stations giving us excellent coverage. Since that time, three stations have discontinued carrying our programmes. This has presented a problem for the schools of Regina, Saskatoon, and Moose Jaw. Reports from their Superintendents indicate that

in each case difficulty in obtaining static free reception of broadcasts has resulted in decreased listening. They all indicate that if the local station carried our programmes they would be able to make more use of material offered. We feel sure that if the three stations concerned carried school broadcasts again these difficulties would be almost entirely overcome. Adequate coverage is essential to maintaining our services. We direct your attention to this need.

Our second concern is to protect our broadcast time. Our programmes in Saskatchewan are presented from 2:00 p.m. to 2:30 p.m. each afternoon. We feel that with the advent of television the changing emphasis on the value of daytime periods may affect the school broadcast period. We hope this half hour can be maintained for school use. This Department feels that this period fits well into classroom schedules.

Thirdly, may we refer again to our request that the Commission consider these educational services as a joint effort by the Department of Education and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and private stations. We also feel the responsibility of the Provincial Departments of Education should in no way be minimized.

Our last point of emphasis deals with school television. The Commission is aware that experiments in educational television for

Canadian schools have been presented by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation with the approval of the Canadian Education Association and the National Advisory Council. Television for our schools is still in the experimental stage. In the experiments we have had the utmost co-operation from schools, retail merchants and manufacturers, who loaned sets, and all television stations across Canada. When it seems advisable to present school telecasts on a regular basis, this Department recommends that the same policy of co-operation that exists for school broadcasts should be maintained for school telecasts. The policy of shared costs and shared responsibilities should exist in both fields. We realize that, at the present time, television has limited value for Saskatchewan schools. However, we appreciate the fact that this may change very rapidly, and wish to safeguard our opportunity to develop this medium when adequate channels are available.

In conclusion, on behalf of the Department of Education, may I extend our appreciation and thanks to all those who have worked with us in presenting educational broadcasts for schools. We look forward optimistically to offering better and extended services in the future. We are charged with this trust. The degree to which we can carry out our objectives will depend on continued co-operation. We therefore repeat that our purpose

in meeting with this Commission is to present our request for the best possible coverage, protection of time on the air, and the opportunity to continue our activities as planned by this Department and the National Advisory Council to which we belong.

This is respectfully submitted.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Miss Murray. You have made your summary not only interesting but also very clear. Do you wish to add anything at this time, Mr. Janzen?

MR. JANZEN: I would just like to say we have had such a very fine experience in developing our broadcast programmes throughout the last thirteen years by having full co-operation by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and the private stations along with the Department of Education that we would like to see that same type of co-operation continued. We are concerned in case we should lose the time we now have on the air from 2:00 p.m. to 2:30 p.m. every day. We want full coverage of the province, and we want to do as good a job as we can, and we think the way it has been handled in the past through the joint efforts of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and the private stations is excellent, and we are very pleased with it.

We have grown progressively through the years by working together in that way, and we hate to think of anything happening that would destroy that possibility of working together in that way.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think we will have some questions now. Will you start, Mr. deGrandpre?

MR. deGRANDPRE: Mr. Coyne will ask the questions Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right, Mr. Coyne.

MR. COYNE: Miss Murray, just referring to the text of your brief, at the bottom of your first page you refer to the division of costs of school broadcasts between the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and the Department of Education, and you point out that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation provides broadcasting facilities, time on the air, network and line facilities, and services of production and technical staff, and assumes the responsibility for the actual production of school broadcasts.

I preseume they do all those things without charge to the Department of Education. Is that right?

MISS MURRAY: Yes, they do.

MR. JANZEN: That is right.

MR. COYNE: On the other hand you say the Department of Education plan and prepare the material and supervise the administration of

school participation and pay the costs of programmes, script writing, acting and musical talent. If I understand correctly the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation produces these programmes in the technical sense, but then, for example, do they then bill the Department of Education for the cost of the programmes, script writing, acting and musical talent?

MISS MURRAY: It is done in two ways. In most cases we pay the script writers directly, and in the case of talent in some cases where talent is employed, for instance in Winnipeg, in some place other than Regina, the bills are submitted through the C.B.C. to us. They pay the actors and then we pay the C.B.C., but if the people are employed here and we have direct relationship with them then we pay them directly.

MR. COYNE: Are there any other costs of programmes which the Department of Education pays apart from script writing and payment to actors and musicians who take part in the broadcasts.

MISS MURRAY: On some occasions we assume some costs. For example when we take the C.B.C. staff with us our in the field to, say, for example going to Saskatoon to present a series of broadcasts there, we are responsible for some of the costs in taking the staff away from the station to make

recordings for us.

THE CHAIRMAN: Miss Murray, you would also be responsible for the costs of any of the supporting publications too, wouldn't you?

MISS MURRAY: Yes.

MR. JANZEN: I was going to say the manual we get out for the teachers, for instance, from the Provincial Department of Education, the costs are very heavy. The manual sets out the whole broadcasting activities, and the set up of the whole broadcasting branch is quite an expensive item in our budget.

MR. COYNE: Do you have a figure as to what the department spends on school broadcasts say in the current year, or in the past year?

MISS MURRAY: It is about thirty-five thousand dollars, the complete budget.

MR. COYNE: Does that cover the costs of operating the school broadcasts branch?

MISS MURRAY: Yes.

MR. COYNE: And also the costs of script writing?

MISS MURRAY: Yes, that is right.

MR. COYNE: What about the position of a private station which carries the broadcast? You point out that the C.B.C. provides these various facilities, and I suppose when a private station carries the broadcast it provides the free time necessary for the network?

MISS MURRAY: Yes.

MR. JANZEN: Courtesy on the part of the station.

MR. COYNE: Are any programmes of the school broadcast branch produced by private stations, or are they all produced by the C.B.C.?

MISS MURRAY: No, they are produced by the C.B.C.

MR. COYNE: On page 2 you are referring to the development of school broadcasts and you give some figures as to the number of schools with radios and you say, "this indicates that 88.7% of our 3,400 operating schools now have radio equipment, which is a very large proportion": do you anticipate that will increase. Are you striving to have 100% coverage for the schools?

MISS MURRAY: That is our objective, yes.

MR. COYNE. What is the limiting factor at the moment? Is it a matter of funds to buy radios?

MISS MURRAY: Yes, it is a matter of funds, and in some cases it is a matter or power; in some schools they are waiting until they receive power.

MR. JANZEN: That is electric power.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there also the factor that certain schools may be situated in a place

where they cannot get radio signals?

MISS MURRAY: There is some difficulty there, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Which might impede them going into this field.

MR. COYNE: You also say at the bottom of that page that, "equipped schools are found in every area of the province from fringe areas and Indian schools in the north to those along the southern border. They are found in greater numbers in non-urban areas since it is the isolated school districts which find them of special value." Are there schools in the city areas which do not take advantage of service, where I presume there would not be any economic difficulty or any problem of electric power, or any difficulty of that kind?

MISS MURRAY: Yes, that is a particular concern to us at the moment because we feel the city schools are not able to make adequate use of radio because they haven't good reception. They are in areas of the city where reception troubles are very serious to them.

THE CHAIRMAN: You mean right in Regina?

MISS MURRAY: Yes.

MR. COYNE: I gather from what you say that C.B.K. which is the high power C.B.C. station is not necessary well received in these city areas?

MISS MURRAY: No.

MR. JANZEN: They have the small sets they purchased when they had the private stations here giving us the broadcasts, and since that private station is now not carrying school broadcasts they cannot pick up Watrous with the small sets which they have and so they are getting poor reception.

MISS MURRAY: They can pick up a private station. I tested it out myself very often in schools, and the reception of the private station is adequate but, C.B.K. is not.

MR. COYNE: Have you any idea as to why the programmes of the branch were discontinued by these private stations you mentioned.

MISS MURRAY: No.

MR. COYNE: You are not in a position to give any explanation as why they have been dropped?

MISS MURRAY: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would certainly like to find that out, because there may be a good explanation for it and there may not be.

MR. JANZEN: We can say we were very sorry when they did drop them.

THE CHAIRMAN: I notice that you did have C.F.Q.C. in Saskatoon and C.K.R.M., Regina and C.H.A.B. in Moosejaw which withdrew the service?

MR. JANZEN: That is right.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: But despite the withdrawal of these three stations you still have practically full coverage in the Province?

MISS MURRAY: Yes, we have very wide coverage but the difficulty is for the city schools to get good clear reception.

MR. JANZEN: I think with good sets in the schools they still could get Watrous, but they purchased sets when we used the private stations. They get a grant for the first set bought, but not for the second or third set.

MISS MURRAY: Further to that Mr. Janzen, last week I tried out a very adequate set here in a school in the city; it certainly could give very good service in any school, but on that set we could not bring in Watrous very easily.

THE CHAIRMAN: You could not?

MISS MURRAY: We could not bring it in easily.

MR. COYNE: Has the Department had any consultations with the C.B.C. with respect to these difficulities of coverage or the inadequate coverage?

MISS MURRAY: Yes, our work through the stations relations branch; we sent them our feelings.

MR. COYNE: But the private stations have not been persuaded to start again to carry your broadcasts?

MISS MURRAY: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Certainly if there was any explanation for this, not that anyone has to justify removing a contribution, but notwithstanding there may be good reasons behind it, that may be more than interesting to hear. However, you don't know what they are,

MISS MURRAY: No.

MR. COYNE: Miss Murray, on page 3 near the top of the page you say, "there is also a growing audience among the adults who share these school broadcasts with their children by listening at home". Is that something which your department actually encourages, or is it----

MISS MURRAY: We certainly do encourage it because we feel that if the parents understand what the children are receiving, they will understand the use to which we are putting it.

MR. COYNE: So this growing adult audience is to some extent the result of active work on the part of the department to encourage that sort of thing?

MISS MURRAY: In some cases we have planned a series of broadcasts which have devoted a portion of the time to parents listening to encourage them to listen.

MR. COYNE: Do you provide any sort of written material which is available to the parents as distinct from the children?

MISS MURRAY: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Referring to your broadcasts?

MISS MURRAY: Yes, for the last two years we have prepared discussion guides and printed materials for parents in connecting with the health series because, we feel it is a matter of parents and teachers and children all co-operating in the field of health.

MR. COYNE: Turning to page 6, first of all you are dealing with the time periods, 2 to 2:30 p.m. in which you put on your broadcasts, and you mentioned in your opening remarks - it is not specifically in the brief - that you were concerned about the effect of the advent of television upon day time periods in radio. Could you explain a little more fully what you mean there?

MISS MURRAY: The time that we have on the air is very important to schools because it must be fitted in in such a way that it will avoid recess periods and noon hour periods and not conflict too seriously with tight school schedules. The afternoon time is certainly the best time for us to use. We feel if this time becomes increasingly more valuable to the stations they may want to shift that time to morning time or ahead or behind in the afternoon.

MR. COYNE: And you feel the advent of television may result in a shift in the radio field?

MISS MURRAY: Yes.

MR. COYNE: When afternoon time is more valuable than it used to be?

MISS MURRAY: Yes.

MR. JANZEN: With the coming of television the time from say, 4 o'clock on is one that is valued now from a telecast point of view, so that the radio producer will think of the time preceding 4 o'clock as being much more important perhaps than it was before, and because of that, we are a little bit afraid that may be the other private stations we have would feel that that time is so important to them they would not want to give us from 2 o'clock to 2:30.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: The inclusion of those remarks about time in your brief does not indicate any immediate threat of losing that time; you are merely explaining the value of that particular time to you; is that it?

MR. JANZEN: That is correct.

MR. COYNE: In connection with the experimental telecast, both the private television stations in Saskatchewan have been carrying these telecasts have they?

MISS MURRAY: Yes, they have.

MR. COYNE: I presume that is without charge to the department?

MISS MURRAY: Yes, it is.

MR. COYNE: In connection with television and its arrival as a new medium, do you feel that for the purposes of school broadcasting it will tend to replace radio, or will it in some sense affect your radio school broadcasts? Do you anticipate that both will exist together for school broadcast purposes?

MISS MURRAY: Yes, I would anticipate that; I think they each have a definite contribution to make.

MR. COYNE: Has the department or your branch made any study or given any consideration to the additional costs that television envolves as distinct from radio.

MR. JANZEN: May I comment on that: just two weeks ago we had two day conference in Regina a provincial conference called by the adult educational branch of our department of Education with respect to television in the schools, and there we discussed the matter of value of it, the cost and many other factors. I think we came out with this conclusion, at least in some of the groups, that we were not going to think of this as a competing agency or medium, but we were going to try to find out the possible use that we could make of it. We thought of the problems such as, has it any value over the sound film? We have a very fine visual department here and

we have a great number of films in our film libraries. Now what advantage has a television over a sound film, and so on? We decided we were not going to think of this as competing but we were going to study television, and experiment with it as these ideas come up and try to find the very best use we can make out of it.

MR. COYNE: So that, really, as a medium for school broadcasting television is still at an early experimental stage?

MR. JANZEN: That is correct.

MR. COYNE: But if I interpret your brief correctly, as it develops you would like to see the same sort of co-operative arrangements between the Department of Education, the C.B.C. and private stations as has developed in radio?

MR. JANZEN: Yes, that is exactly it.

MISS MURRAY: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: On that principle, it is obvious that the costs involved to your departments are likely to be higher than on radio and also to the individual schools because sets themselves are more expensive; but you think that gradually this could be handled in the same pattern as the radio was handled, do you?

MR. JANZEN: Well, we just do not know until we find out what the costs might be. If they are very excessive, I imagine we would move rather slowly.

MR. COYNE: Those are all the questions I have.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have only one rather general question to ask, perhaps both of you; leaving television aside for the moment because it is so very much at the start, have you formed any judgment as to the educative value of radio as a means of tying into the school curriculum? Is this something which is a real advance in the educative process over what it was, let us say, before there was any radio? Have you got any opinion on how this medium works and what its value is on education? In a brief way I would be interested to hear it.

MR. JANZEN: I would be very glad to speak on that, because we are so grateful in this Province for what has developed largely through Miss Murray's efforts that we think it is one of the finest supplementary aids we can have in the classroom. There are so many things in a classroom

that a teacher particularly in the rural schools cannot do herself. What we try to do on the radio is things that the teacher cannot do herself, it is a supplementary aid. There is a combined programme in Manitoba and Saskatchewan where we have a programme that interests young boys and girls in creative art in such a way that we have had a tremendous growth in this field for the last few years in both Provinces. This is something a teacher would not do by herself unless she was a very exceptional teacher in these fields, so we have these teachers coming into the classrooms through the radio that give these supplementary aids. We have sound in this Province through up to 3400 schools. Now, using this aid, I had the opportunity of meeting with many superintendents of schools and teachers and interests and we have the very highest commendation for these aids that go into the classroom, and we are very, very happy with it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I assume that 3500 schools could not all be wrong, but I just wanted to know what the value was and you have answered that.

MR. JANZEN: May I say that just today we received a copy of the research on Canadian schools put out by the Canadian Teachers' Federation. We looked for disadvantages, which we could not find, and we saw many advantages listed, and in this matter we meet once a year, we have a Western group -- the four Western Provinces meet once a year also and

plan programmes together and we have a pretty good idea of what is going on in this field, and we are very happy about it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just on that point, you mentioned a joint programme with Manitoba, and these other meetings, is that developing as fully as it should with inter-provincial collaboration between the Departments of Education?

MISS MURRAY: I think that is perhaps one of the happiest forms of co-operation that has been worked out within the Council. It gives us an opportunity to meet together to exchange ideas of programming and to work together wherever possible. In some cases we have two Provinces working together, three, four, and sometimes ten, and in that way we feel that we are bringing the best material at the least cost to our schools.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you not also get from it one of the influences which is a function of tying different parts of the country together?

MISS MURRAY: Yes, there is a national unity.

MR. JANZEN: May I just mention this in that connection: In the West, under this Western Regional Committee, we meet one year in Winnipeg, one year in Regina, one year in Edmonton and one year in Vancouver, and not only do our supervisors meet at that time but also our broadcast and cirrucula come together; at that time we spend one day with the broadcast people so we tie in the curricula

work with broadcasters and also have the opportunity to meet together with each other to plan joint work in our Provinces, and we feel it is a very good influence.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you both very much. We have your brief and we will consider it and thank you for taking the trouble to come.

SUBMISSION OF CANADIAN FEDERATION OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN.

APPEARANCES:

Miss Marion Gilroy.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief we are to receive is from the Canadian Federation of University Women, and I understand that Miss Marion Gilroy will present that brief.

We will start off by marking your brief, Miss Gilroy, as Exhibit 59.

EXHIBIT NO. 59: Brief of Canadian Federation of University Women.

MISS GILROY: Mr. Chairman and Commission members, I shall just touch a few of the highlights of our brief. It is our opinion that the C.B.C. has made an outstanding contribution to Canadian life. Our concern is with the problems of the arts, letters and science and discussion, and this is

both a personal concern among individual members and collectively, and our interest in our programmes are to continue education at informal or formal meetings, and we are also concerned with the whole state of education and the arts in Canada. We have mentioned specifically a number of programmes which we receive on C.B.C. radio and television which we think do make a very real contribution to the arts in Canada, and in the field of music, drama, news and commentary on public affairs and certain of the programmes for children. I shall not enumerate these, but we have listed the ones that we feel have a particularly high standard and are of interest to our members. We would like to look forward to the time when Canada has a population and resources to support a national radio and television system which will permit us in that work to correspond with the B.B.C.'s third programme. One of our points there is that we shall be spared a great deal of the advertising that we are not now able to operate our radio and television set-up without. We would like to make the recommendation that when finances permit the C.B.C. would consider publication of some periodical like the Listener which we hold in very high regard. We feel there is a very high legitimate claim on our public money to provide us with the sort of programmes that we have mentioned in our brief, and we feel that this not only gives the listener or the viewer the service that we have received and hope to receive, but it is an opportunity

for creative artists in Canada to find an opportunity to develop their abilities, find an outlet for their talents and at the same time make a living in Canada. The C.B.C., we feel, encourages performers and sets standards by making it possible for them to hear and see the best by the best.

We feel through radio and television the C.B.C. is bringing us the resources of our national museum, art gallery, library, and in time our national theatre, ballet, opera, and we feel that this is a force that unites Canada and gives one region a knowledge of what is happening in other parts of the country. We wish particularly to commend the C.B.C. for the generally high standard of speech and feel that this is helping the new citizens in Canada to master English and French. We feel that with the increased leisure that automation will bring, that radio and television will play an increasingly large part, and we had thought that at least some of the time of the national network would be geared to an adult education programme.

We feel that instead of making a long brief we could summarize the opinion of the Canadian Federation of University Women: that they recommend the findings of the Massey Commission as far as our publicly-owned C.B.C. radio and television are concerned as set forth in Chapter 18 of their Report. We feel that without the C.B.C. as it has functioned over the past twenty years we should be a poor nation, poor in those things which make a country truly

great, in ideas, information, education and the creative arts. In our opinion it is well worthwhile and it is worth paying for from taxation. Once we accept this premise, adequate funds should be forthcomung to operate the C.B.C. radio and television network as a public service, free from undue pressures, and one in which we can take pride.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Miss Gilroy. Mr. Coyne?

MR. COYNE: Your brief is presented on behalf of the National Organization?

MISS GILROY: Yes, it is.

MR. COYNE: The Canadian Federation of University Women?

MISS GILROY: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Turning to the bottom of the first page of your brief, you say:

"Distinguished radio and television pro-
"grammes, we believe, are well worth
"paying for and have a legitimate claim
"on public funds."

I just wanted to ask you whether you distinguish between different types of programmes as far as their claim on public funds is concerned, and in particular I would ask you what about light entertainment and variety programmes which are now being provided on television and, in large measure, financed out of public funds? Do you feel that that is -- that it is proper for a national network to provide that type of programme as it is to provide what you might

call a more educative type of programme?

MISS GILROY: Well, it is very difficult to say what an organization of 7,000 members would say, there would be 7,000 opinions; but I think the programmes we are particularly interested in, some of them would be considered light entertainment; I do not know where you would classify "Rawhide", but surely if individual people want what is generally classified as light entertainment some of it should be provided, but I think not at the expense of the sort of programme that we wish particularly to commend to you.

MR. COYNE: But you are not going so far as to suggest that, for instance, the C.B.C. should drop this light entertainment and variety programmes and produce exclusively programmes you might describe as educative?

MISS GILROY: No, we do not take that extreme stand. I think in elaboration we might say they should not always be given priority in listening time; that is, some of the programmes we support should not appear late at night and should be given as good time as some of the lighter programmes on the C.B.C. schedule.

MR. COYNE: One suggestion that has been made to us is that if you view this national service in terms of national values, that it is possible to distinguish between different types of programmes; or it has been suggested to us that educative and informative programmes are worth financing out of

public funds but pure entertainment are not worth financing out of public funds and should be provided as best they can by commercial interests.

MISS GILROY: I just do not know where you could draw the line. One person's entertainment is another person's education, and I would not be prepared to say that distinction could be made because it depends so much on the individual who is listening or looking at the programme.

MR. COYNE: At page 2, about the middle paragraph, you are speaking of the increase in leisure time and you say:

> "That this leisure can be enriched is
> "obvious if we have a national radio and
> "television network which, part-time at
> "least, will provide an adult education
> "programme geared to our interests and
> "needs."

Now, I would like to ask you what you envisage as the role of the private broadcasting stations in this system? At the present time the national system has been partly public-owned and partly supported by privately-owned stations. Do you have any views as to the role of the private stations in the national network and television network?

MISS GILROY: Well, I think that this is more of a personal matter; having a national committee scattered across the country, they could not be here to speak for a wider point of view, but I would say in our discussions before we did the brief

that we would feel the privately-owned radio stations could perform local, community service, but we look to the C.B.C. to provide us with the national programmes and in the provision of adult education programmes. I would feel that if the private stations were co-operating with local agencies, that there is a job for them to do. Whether they would give preference to the kind of programme that would come from commercial review I think would depend on the management and interest of the local stations in which there is very wide variety of reaction to the approach from groups interested in education, in the arts, for the sort of programmes they are interested in.

MR. COYNE: But by and large I gather from what you say that your Association accepts or supports in general terms the type of system that we have at the present time?

MISS GILROY: Yes, we do.

MR. COYNE: Just referring to the following paragraph on page 2, you say:

"Our Federation is strongly of the opinion
"that the C.B.C. is doing as effective a
"job as it is because it is a publicly-
"owned and operated Corporation, res-
"ponsible to Parliament and so to the
"people of Canada."

Among the suggestions that have been raised before the Commission, some persons have suggested that there may be a danger in having an arm of the State controlling communications media such as radio and

television. For instance, it is quite contrary to the sort of system we are accustomed to in newspaper publishing. Does your Organization feel any concern as to the possible danger that a State organization controlling broadcasting might give rise to?

MISS GILROY: We are judging and commending the C.B.C. on the record of its performance over twenty years, which we feel has not been a threat but rather a promise, and it is judged on its merits. It has, I think, given us a very fair point of view on controversial issues which must be a complicated stand to take and it certainly, to the best of our consideration and our judgment, has been no threat, it has not been a menace; it has, on the contrary, made a very great contribution, I think, and I am sure the members of my Committee feel that they have done a most commendable job in avoiding and in not succumbing to the pressures that you speak of.

THE CHAIRMAN: Perhaps you would summarize by saying that perhaps this was a potential anxiety or danger, but on performance you think it has not shown itself?

MISS GILROY: We would say "no" and certainly if it did I hope that the Canadian people would make themselves heard and express their opinion.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is another slightly different but very similar question as to the effect of getting these educational, collateral matters from

a State agency; do you think it has any tendency, or there is any evidence at all, that it may restrict the individual initiative, the local flowering of different types of culture and so on? Are we going to be reduced to national mediocrity by this method? I am not talking about the power of the State, I am talking about the effect on culture and educational and artistic matters. Is there a reliance needed on personal, individual initiative for it to grow?

MISS GILROY: Well, I think we need personal initiative to encourage arts and education, but I think that as far as the C.B.C. is concerned it has given so much opportunity for young, gifted people to do programmes for them that it has probably kept them in Canada and it must, from that point of view, have given them a chance to develop their individual abilities and to make a living here; whereas, if we had not had that sort of encouragement and fostering of them and their talents they would be gone elsewhere to get a larger audience. Certainly the number of young musicians and dramatists who have stayed in Canada because the C.B.C. gave them an opportunity to make a living, must have made a great different in the artistic life of the country. We do not think of it only as a national service, but as it operates regionally and locally, they are on the look-out, I would say, for people who can make a contribution to Canadian radio and television.

THE CHAIRMAN: Going back to your answer to Mr. Coyne on the relative roles of the C.B.C. on

the one hand and private stations on the other, I understood you to say you think the primary responsibility for a programme would and should remain with the C.B.C. Is that necessarily right? On the first page of your brief you are talking of various kinds of activity in the artistic and cultural sphere and the C.B.C. has done. Now I can understand that a local station would have difficulty in sponsoring a symphony orchestra, but can it not do something in the way of a string quartette or something of that sort? Is there not a role for private stations which, to some extent, might counteract this uniformity?

MISS GILRDY: I would like to think the private stations would take a very real interest in their communities, in encouraging that sort of programme, and I think that some of them do. I think there is a great variation in the performances and the standards of the private stations, but judged on the record I think that there is still a great deal that they could do, more than they have done in that field.

THE CHAIRMAN: Maybe organizations such as yours, we may have 7,000 active women across the country who consider these matters and if it is public opinion perhaps express it.

MISS GILROY: Well, I think that is something we could certainly consider and in many communities I think the University Women do make demands and requests of local radio stations.

MR. COYNE: Miss Gilroy, turning to page 3, the last paragraph where you are summing up, you say, talking about the C.B.C. and the things you have been speaking of:

> "This is worthwhile, and it is worth pay-
> "ing for from taxation. Once we accept
> "this premise, adequate funds should be
> "forthcoming to operate the C.B.C. radio
> "and television network as a public ser-
> "vice free from undue pressures, and one
> "in which we can take pride."

I do not suppose your Organization has given much thought to what would be adequate funds, but have you any ideas or suggestions as to the level at which you think public funds should be made available to the C.B.C.? If you have any ideas it would be of great interest to the Commission.

MISS GILROY: I would imagine that we are guilty of some vagueness of statement there, but we are not thinking in terms of any specific amount of money which we do not feel we have the knowledge to recommend to a body such as your Commission.

If it is a question in the decision of programming on the C.B.C., whether or not a symphony orchestra programme can be broadcast without a sponsor, we feel it should be considered that there are people who could commend the C.B.C. for its considered fault, this is really a legitimate expenditure of money and a wise expenditure of public money, and it is not, it cannot be equated always as to what

has been received from it in the amount of money that is spent to produce the programme. That is not a satisfactory answer and we know it, but we feel that very often in Canada we get money for Trans-Canada highways and money for the material things and that additional importance should be given in spending public money to non-material and artistic programmes.

THE CHAIRMAN: The trouble is, and I do not suggest for a moment that your Organization should be in a position to do it, but this is our problem: when you are trying to build a highway you can pretty well figure out the limits, determine what is adequate, you have certain engineering standards that can be used to measure what is adequate and what is needed. When you are in the field of education and culture and the like it is awfully hard to find a yardstick for adequacy, and I assume your Organization would agree that there are limits beyond which this process cannot go and there are points at which we cannot or should not spend more than a certain amount. In other words, this is not an open-ended operation and it can never be.

MISS GILROY: Well, we do not feel that way but we feel if we err in one direction it is an under-estimate rather than an over-estimate of the length to which we can go.

MR. COYNE: Just one other question arising out of the same subject. There is, of course, the question not only as to the amount of funds that should be made available, but as to the

method in which they should be obtained; has your Organization given any thought to the question of financing television, say, through a license fee levied against everyone who owns a television set?

MISS GILROY: I think that we have not, as a group, ever given any specific consideration to it, although some years ago when the report of the Royal Commission on Arts, Letters and Sciences came out it was very generally approved by the members of the Canadian Federation of University Women, and in that a fee was recommended. All I can say is, there was never any expression of opinion from the Federation that that was undesirable. Whether that means they would give it approval if a specific vote were taken, I couldn't say.

MR. COYNE: You are not in a position to say now how your Organization would feel about it?

MISS GILROY: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Miss Gilroy, for your brief.

---A short recess.

SUBMISSION OF SASKATCHEWAN ARTS BOARD

APPEARANCES:

Mrs. W.L. Oddie.

Mr. S.S. Boyling.

Mr. K.G. Aberdeen.

Mrs. F.B. James.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief we are to hear is from the Saskatchewan Arts Board, and I understand Mrs. W.L. Oddie will present that. Mrs. Oddie, would you introduce the other members?

MRS. ODDIE: Yes, the other members of this representation are Mrs. James, who is a staff member of the Saskatchewan Arts Board; Mr. Boyling, the Chairman of our Radio Committee, and Mr. Aberdeen.

EXHIBIT NO. 60: Brief of the Saskatchewan Arts Board.

MRS. ODDIE: I am presenting this brief on behalf of Dr. Riddell, Chairman of the Saskatchewan Arts Board, who is unable to be here.

This brief is a submission of the Saskatchewan Arts Board to the Royal Commission on Television Broadcasting, which was appointed in December, 1955 by the Prime Minister and Council of Canada, and contains the views and recommendations of the Saskatchewan Arts Board concerning the development of television broadcasting in Canada.

The Saskatchewan Arts Board was set up by an Act of the Provincial Legislature in 1949, to serve the people of Saskatchewan in the development

and encouragement of the arts, and to make available to them more opportunities to enjoy and engage in cultural activities. In connection with that, Mr. Chairman, you have had our Arts Board Reports.

The Saskatchewan Arts Board started with a budget of $5,000 in 1949. Since that times its services have grown to the extent that a budget of $35,000 has now been appropriated. In the carrying out of various projects in the Province the Saskatchewan Arts Board has been in a position to observe closely the effect of broadcasting throughout Saskatchewan.

In support of broadcasting services, the Saskatchewan Arts Board has carefully considered the audio-visual programmes carried on the network and have frequently issued bulletins listing the better programmes. Some of these are, I believe, too in the hands of the Commission.

From such experience, we believe that the national system of broadcasting including the C.B.C., is of inestimable value to both rural and urban audiences, and to the public generally, because of the aims it has. These aims, established some twenty years ago, are worth restating.

First, to provide the best possible programme service in sound and television to persons living in every part of Canada.

To satisfy a wide variety of tastes and needs in entertainment (drama, music, variety), information (news, farm and fisheries, women's programmes), and to meet such special needs as children's

programmes, religious and institutional programmes, school broadcasts, and so on.

Third, to reflect in its programming all aspects of Canadian life, including all significant trends and developments in the arts and sciences, in education, sociology, public health, industry, agriculture and fisheries, conservation, etcetera, and to provide a forum for discussion and a balanced presentation of views in the field of public affairs.

Fourth, to foster and sustain Canadian talent in music, both instrumental and vocal, and musical composition; in drama and ballet, and in dramatic and other forms of writing suitable for presentation by sound or television.

Fifth, to contribute to Canadian development as a nation by drawing on the traditions, folk-ways, and cultural resources of every part of Canada for programme material, encouraging those things which are characteristic of the different sections of the country, but regarding them as a common heritage to be shared by all.

Referring generally to broadcasting, it is our view that the C.B.C. has been carrying out its complex responsibility with a high degree of effect, yet with sufficient flexibility to adapt and make changes based on trial, criticism and demand. However, we believe there is, and always will be, room for improvement.

The Saskatchewan Arts Board submits the following points specifically regarding television

broadcasts:

Conflict in policies: In our view the total television system should remain a matter of Federal responsibility because it is too large and potent a medium to be left in the hands of individuals. That is, television should be controlled by the people of Canada through its elected Government because it is essentially, first and foremost, a public service. Television in the United States is entirely private enterprise and the enormous sums spent on it are, primarily, to attract large American viewing audiences and to promote sales which is distinctly different from the stated aims of the national broadcasting in Canada. Commercial programmes are too often planned by sponsors to give what they think the majority of people want; these programmes, with a few notable exceptions, are mostly of inferior cultural quality. This pattern is being imitated by commercial interests in Canada. It is our conviction that the tastes, interests and capacities of the public are greatly underrated, both in the United States and in our own country.

The sponsor spending large sums of money for television programmes is naturally concerned with advantageous viewing times, because he wishes to get the best return for his investment. Therefore the best viewing time, which, of course, is limited, becomes the rich investor's prerogative, and the interest and pleasure of the viewing audience are sacrificed to commercial considerations. Because

of such pressures some excellent programmes over C.B.C. are frequently scheduled for the Prairies too late at night for full audience enjoyment.

We are happy to note that within one month of the advent of commercial T.V. in the British Isles, the outcry against this changed pattern was so great that commercials were restricted, in time, to a proper place in the programme. We would point out that in Canada today the amount of advertising on the networks goes much beyond that considered desirable by the Aird Commission which studied this problem in 1928.

Therefore, we strongly recommend that commercials should be kept in proper balance with programmes of C.B.C. origination or any programmes which measure up to the initial standards proclaimed for the national system as a whole.

The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation's policy of sustaining Canadian talent in music and musical composition, drama and play-writing and other arts usable on radio and television, is paying tremendous dividends to the development of Canadian art. Canadian artists have, in the last few years, been receiving the recognition that native talent deserves. That the Canadian actor, musician, composer and writer were able to survive, and command this recognition, is largely due to the fact that their major support and source of income came from the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. "Art is communication", and the audiences to whom Canadian artists speak are, in large measure, the audiences

of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, a highly commendable achievement.

We would like to recommend that with the technical extensions soon to be operating for the national network, more talent at the local level be used, permitting the private stations to fulfil their obligation towards local musicians, actors and writers. We believe that the good talks, music and drama at present originating from the large Canadian centres, could be initiated on a proportionately smaller scale by the local stations of the national system. For example, the C.B.C. programme "Trans-Canada Matinee" over radio, which has consistently improved in content since it started about two years ago, could be emulated by local stations. A programme such as this provides an excellent opportunity for a wide variety of talent, presented in various ways, and could include specialized talks, utilizing the local resources for topics and personnel.

Newscasts: We recommend that the national news reports telecast over C.B.C. be fully extended to present complete coverage comparable to the news services provided on radio, so that the viewers are provided to the same degree as radio listeners with the national news. There should be no curtailment of national news on the public communication systems.

In closing, we would like to acknowledge the effective link between the publicly-owned and the private radio stations which has contributed

in so short a time to some excellent development of television programming in Canada. Probably many people living in this area do not realize how important are the private stations in bringing service to people in other parts of the country. Nor perhaps do people living in areas served by private stations, realize what an important job the C.B.C. is doing in providing national service, including both imported and Canadian programmes, to their local station and so on to them. So far, Canada is unique in this kind of co-operation between public and private enterprise. It is now face to face with some serious challenges from commercial interests. The advertising industry itself must take cognizance of the fact that the Canadian public wants quality and variety in its television programming and not meaningless and degrading forms of entertainment. We believe the public has discrimination and the wit to recognize the present unsatisfactory impact of boring, repetive and unfortunate modes of advertising. The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has the responsibility of screening programmes, raising standards and protecting the public. It is our conviction that the needs of the Canadian public should govern and guide the policy of C.B.C., for Canadian television. The role of the Canadian Broadcasting System in unifying the Canadian people as a nation, is one of its most significant functions and should constantly be exploited to this desirable end.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Oddie, have you or

any of those with you anything you wish to add to your written brief?

MR. BOYLING: Perhaps I should explain that I am the manager of Radio Station CHAB, and I was invited to sit on the Arts Board, and I have been a member for a number of years. When the Arts Board decided to submit a brief I was East and it had been written before I came back. It is not that I disagree with the brief; it is that I feel in some points there may be omissions.

One point I noticed, in the development of the arts or specifically the development of talent, musical talent, I think the private stations, one of their big functions is giving experience and opportunity to people who are not considered of network quality. I think there is real need for a person who wishes to perform -- and I am using music as an example because it is a very simple one -- but there is a need for people to have the opportunity to perform and perform quite frequently to gain the experience and develop in the arts of broadcasting and T.V. I think that is very important.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Boyling, on that point I think that the point you make is obviously a good one, that a new musician has to start somewhere appearing in public, and one way of working up to the national programme is to work on the local programmes, but does this, in fact, happen? It has been said to us that the great majority of the musical programmes on the private stations are so-called

canned programmes. They are the disc jockey type on the radio. We have not had too much evidence put to us as to what degree to which this obviously desirable thing, in fact, has been done. Take in your own station: it is a good thing to train young musicians and give them a chance to appear on the air, but how often does it happen?

MR. BOYLING: May I speak of my own station?

THE CHAIRMAN: Certainly.

MR. BOYLING: Our station for twenty years has had on its payroll a lady who was the winner of one of the highest awards, the Justice Brown award, a qualified music teacher, and her responsibility with us has been to present a fifteen-minute programme each week of young talent -- and when I say young I refer to about fourteen, fifteen or under. These children do not appear unless they have been endorsed and with the permission of a music teacher. They are given training in broadcasting technique and they appear as a programme,but not as an artist, weekly. This has been going on for about twenty years. Within the last ten years, at the request of another instructor in music who felt that talent who had entered their teens and up to about thirty years of age were not getting the opportunity to appear in a town of our size, which is between 25,00 and 30,000, they didn't have the opportunity to appear in public and consequently there was need for encouragement. Apparently it was found by these people that a person would practice more diligently and

more frequently if there was an objective. So, this programme has been going now for about ten years every week.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is it a fifteen-minute programme or a thirty-minute programme?

MR. BOYLING: It is a fifteen-minute programme, and this has been going on the same basis for about ten years, and it culminates each year by a concert which the station underwrites, and it is held in the largest hall we have in the city and attendance is about 1,000 people. It is a formal presentation of a great majority of the artists. Some of our choirs number around 200, right down to the individual soloists. This is a stage programme and produced with the one object in mind of presenting these people and giving them the opportunity, mainly for stimulation of their interest in music, and I can say that sincerely, because the lady who originated the idea came to the station and we were wholeheartedly in favour of it. Those are just two examples. I could go on to others, but does that answer your question?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, it does, and I am very glad to have this kind of illustration brought forward. It is very hard to judge these matters by general statements either one side or the other. These are a couple of good illustrations, and I am glad to have them.

Mr. Coyne, would you like to pick up the questioning there, and don't you hesitate, Mr. Boyling

to add further.

MR. COYNE: Mrs. Oddie, turning to the first page of your brief, about the fifth paragraph, you say, "From such experience, we believe that the national system of broadcasting including the C.B.C., is of inestimable value to both rural and urban audiences ...": I presume when you say "including the C.B.C." you would equally say "including the private stations"?

MRS. ODDIE: Yes, that is what is meant. It is mentioned again on page 3 -- the link between the publicly-owned and the private stations which exists at the present time.

MR. COYNE: Really what you are saying is that the over-all system of broadcasting we have at present is of inestimable value?

MRS. ODDIE: Yes, that is my interpretation.

MRS. JAMES: Yes, that is it.

MR. COYNE: Looking through one of your bulletins, it is dated February 28th, 1952, and does this represent a recommendation by the Saskatchewan Arts Board as far as the programmes listed are concerned? I presume this is not a listing of programmes?

MRS. ODDIE: No, it is a selection of programmes which the Saskatchewan Arts Board recommends to listeners.

MR. COYNE: One thing which struck me, looking through it at random, was the very large

number of broadcasts that are private station broadcasts.

MRS. ODDIE: This bulletin is prepared by the Arts Board in co-operation with the radio stations throughout the Province, and they submit to the person in charge of preparing the leaflet programmes which they as a station are doing on a local basis and which they think worthy, and insofar as these programmes merit it they are included in the bulletin for recommendation.

MR. COYNE: But the Arts Board itself goes over the list it receives from the different stations and makes its selections?

MRS. ODDIE: Yes, and someone has listened to them and tried to get some sort of an appraisal; that is not always possible to do that too thoroughly and effectively because these bulletins are prepared twice a year and the programming schedule is always changing and the time is changing, and the radio stations also change their programmes, but as much as possible there is some appraisal by the authority doing the bulletin.

MR. COYNE: I gather from this type of bulletin that there is a large measure of programming originating from various private stations in the Province which your Board endorses and recommends, in the sense that this bulletin may be an endorsement or a recommendation?

MRS. ODDIE: Yes, that is true.

MR. COYNE: Going a little further down

the page, where you refer to conflict in policies, you say, "In our view the total television system should remain a matter of Federal responsibility because it is too large and potent a medium to be left in the hands of individuals. That is, television should be controlled by the people of Canada through its elected Government ...": Have you any specific recommendations as to either the method of control or what elements should be controlled? Are you in a position to make any specific comments on that point?

MRS. ODDIE: I would ask Mrs. James to speak to that.

MRS. JAMES: I think in making that statement here the Arts Board feel that the control that is exercised now is very good and that it should not be curtailed, and in general approves it as an adequate way of handling this public medium.

MR. COYNE: Would it be fair to say that what you are really suggesting is that the system we now have with respect to radio is the system you recommend with regard to television?

MRS. JAMES: Yes, I should say so.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Before you leave that subject, it has been one matter that has been brought up at all our hearings, and there is some diversity of opinion on it, and that is as to the manner in which the control is made use of, and certain opinion has been offered to us that the actual regulation of radio broadcasting and television should be taken away from the Canadian Broadcasting

Corporation as such because of the fact that they are producers and exhibitors themselves, and that the regulations should be placed in the hands of a separate body, separate from the C.B.C., but controlling both the C.B.C. and the private networks.

MRS. JAMES: I would like to comment briefly on that, but I am sure Mr. Boyling would have an expression of opinion on it. We were concerned that there should be nothing representing no control. If such a body were set up other than the C.B.C., it may be fair to the C.B.C. not to have this responsibility. We feel the C.B.C. sometimes leans over backwards to be quite fair, but such a body would stand in relationship to the Government in a situation such as the C.B.C. controlling body now stands, and that it would not be left in the hands of individuals to make their own rules and codes, and so forth. It would be a Government body.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: But your Board has no specific recommendations to make?

MRS. JAMES: No. As a matter of fact, we hadn't considered that point.

MR. BOYLING: I believe, of course, in the principle of the private regulatory board.

THE CHAIRMAN: "Private"?

MR. COYNE: Of a public regulatory board?

MR. BOYLING: Of a public regulatory board, pardon me. One of the points that brought it up is that I believe it creates some embarrassment and awkwardness for the C.B.C. this way. We

had an example not so long ago where we thought we would steal a march on the other radio stations in this area for a programme, and requested permission to bring in from one of the stations just below the Border the Rose Bowl Game which was not carried on the Dominion or Trans-Canada network. We thought if we could get permission to carry that one broadcast on New Year's Day it would be an extra feature for our station. We requested permission from the C.B.C. and it was refused. Our relationships personally, as a station and as an individual, have been exceptionally good with the C.B.C., but I think it puts them in an awkward position. While they refused our station permission to bring in an American programme, at the same time they were carrying an American programme from an American network -- a different programme.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Was any reason given for the refusal?

MR. BOYLING: No, sir. So, my principle is that I don't think it is fair to the C.B.C.

THE CHAIRMAN: This suggestion of it being unduly onerous on the C.B.C. probably leads to them leaning over backwards in this matter of control: doesn't that get you into rather a curious position by suggesting that you move into a separate regulatory board? You are merely asking for more effective control.

MR. BOYLING: I think they have been tolerant and they have been exceptionally kind in so many cases. For example, they gave us permission to

drop network to carry a local baseball game, and there is some doubt in my mind that the other type of body would give us permission to do that. However, it is the principle I am concerned with, and I think it is just like a parent with a child who sooner or later has to face a situation, for example, where it may be easier to give the child a candy to stop it crying, even though the doctor says the child should not have candy. They have to take the good with the bad.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is to be control, you say there should be good control?

MR. BOYLING: Yes, sir.

MR. COYNE: Would you not also say, Mr. Boyling, you said it was unfair to the C.B.C., would you also say it is unfair to the private station?

MR. BOYLING: If there is a rule and I think they are just applying the regulation, that is the rule, and what you feel about it I do not think is important. I might object to getting a parking ticket and the man next me did not get one, but if I got the parking ticket, I broke the law, then that is it.

MR. COYNE: Except in the case of the Rose Bowl Game, there was no rule; that is, there was no rule, a general application, and there was only a ruling that said you could not bring in the Rose Bowl Game unless you had permission of some representative of the C.B.C.

MR. BOYLING: Well, I do not know, I do

not think the C.B.C. operate that way, I think they had a good reason for their view.

MR. COYNE: They did not give you their reason, though?

MR. BOYLING: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: It was probably that the time was taken up by another programme.

MR. BOYLING: No, we did not have the network at that time.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Where is your station?

MR. BOYLING: 40 miles west of Regina.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: What city?

MR. BOYLING: Moose Jaw.

MR. COYNE: Mrs. Oddie, going on to the next page, the top of page 2 where you are speaking of commercial influence and you are suggesting that they are adverse to the type of programme that you are in favour of. Do you think that commercial sponsorship in television should be excluded? Do you go that far, suggesting that we should not have commercial sponsorship, say, similar to the B.B.C.?

MRS. ODDIE: I can only speak my personal opinion. No, I do not feel it should be entirely excluded, but I would like to have other opinions.

MRS. JAMES: T.V. is an exceedingly expensive thing and I do not think it can, you could reasonably say that it should be completely excluded; I do think it should be better controlled. I think that when you are looking at a programme with a great deal of interest and suddenly the thing

breaks and you look at a spot ad for soap for maybe three minutes, you not only have to look at it, you have to hear it, and you get the feeling that it does not smell too.

MR. COYNE: I notice further down, about the third paragraph on that page, you say:

"Therefore, we strongly recommend that "commercials should be kept in proper "balance with programmes of C.B.C. origi- "nation or any programmes which measure "up to the initial standards proclaimed "for the national system as a whole."

Just on that point, I would like to ask you this: You say:

" ... commercials should be kept in "proper balance with programmes of C.B.C. "origination -- "

Now, we understand at the present time on the television network 50% of the English-language network, 50% of the C.B.C. programmes are commercially sponsored and, in fact, the proportion would be greater for any individual C.B.C. station. You are not suggesting -- you have said really what you are interested in is control rather than elimination?

MRS. JAMES: Yes, and it is a question, I think it has a great deal to do with the question of taste in the use of commercials. I think they should be at the beginning or at the end of a programme and not have a programme broken by these commercials which are very distracting and very

annoying. At least, I find them that way and I think a great many people do, but they accept it because they get the programme because of it.

THE CHAIRMAN: On this matter of commercials, are you strictly right in the second paragraph of that first section on page 2? You say:

"We are happy to note that within one
"month of the advent of commercial T.V.
"in the British Isles, the outcry against
"this changed pattern was so great that
"commercials were restricted, in time, to
"a proper place in the programme."

MRS. JAMES: That came from a British magazine called "Truth". There was quite a story on it and they could not break a programme to put in the ad.

THE CHAIRMAN: The reason for my question was, I was in England not too long ago and made some inquiries, and while I did not go into it specifically, I think it is not accurate.

MRS. JAMES: It was reported in the magazine.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think there was a restriction from the beginning of the independent television act and no new outcry took place, no new restrictions were imposed.

MRS. JAMES: That may very well be.

THE CNAIRMAN: I think the other thing that may interest you is, the commercial announcements and advertisements on the English television

programmes were devised with such originality and skill that they were actually attracting attention as entertainment themselves.

MRS. JAMES: That, of course, happens here. In watching a Hitchcock programme I was watching Mr. Hitchcock who appears himself, and when we watch this we enjoy the commercial, it gives really a good commercial. Mr. Hitchcock comes in and says, "Let us get it over with, this is why you are here and why I am here so let us get it over with."

MR. COYNE: The paragraph immediately above the one the Chairman just referred to, you say:

> "Therefore the best viewing time, which, "of course, is limited, becomes the rich "investor's prerogative, and the interest "and pleasure of the viewing audience "are sacrificed to commercial considera- "tions."

Now, I take it from that statement that you are saying that we may have to put up with these commercial programmes but it is at the sacrifice of the quality and desirability of the programme? I want to ask you if perhaps that is not an open statement, because, after all, it is the sponsor's money that provides the high quality entertainment programmes which are available both from Canada and from the United States. If it was not for that money we would not have these programmes, or, not the same programmes.

MRS. JAMES: Well, of course, I think the sponsor is sponsoring the programme because he is

getting something out of it, and we want to remind you that after all we are a captive audience. I would like to make reference to something that happened in Saskatchewan that we were very upset about, and that was the first production of Hamlet which came on at 11.00 o'clock at night, and at that night most people are preparing to go to bed after a weekend because they had to go to work on Monday morning and they did not want to sit an hour and a half looking at a programme that would keep them out of bed until 1.00 o'clock. This happened to be an excellent programme and very desirable for young people, and they were eliminated entirely. A great many requests went to the station requesting that such programmes go on at a better hour, but they just could not do it. It was even suggested that it be put on earlier in the afternoon, that they open the station when they have a programme like that and put it in earlier in the afternoon before the other programmes go on to give the youngsters who are studying Shakespeare in school and the viewing audience a chance to see a very excellent C.B.C. production. However, we discovered also that it could not be repeated again, it could only be put on once in the Province because those are the rules. So, having done it once, that was it and there was no opportunity for anyone to see it after that. They also did the same thing with Macbeth and other programmes which came on at that very ungodly hour.

MR. COYNE: I was interested in that, in

your saying it was too late in the Prairies at night and it struck me as strange because you are two hours earlier than the East, but these programmes, I suppose, are on kinescope.

MRS. JAMES: I do not know what the technique is.

MR. COYNE: It is not simultaneous programming, it will not be until the relay system reaches Regina.

MRS. JAMES: That is right, it is on film of something.

MR. COYNE: And a little further down the page you say:

"We would like to recommend that with the
"technical extensions soon to be operating
"for the national network, more talent
"at the local level be used, permitting
"the private stations to fulfil their
"obligations towards local musicians,
"actors and writers."

I see what you have in mind there is local originations being fitted to the network?

MRS. JAMES: That is right, yes.

MR. COYNE: And you are confident that if the local stations were given the chance with the proper facilities, that they could provide some real service in local originations?

MRS. JAMES: I think definitely so. Mr. Boyling has explained about his station and I do not believe that is a common practice, I think that

is rather unique.

MR. BOYLING: Could I speak on that point? The private stations putting on original shows is a very difficult situation and, notwithstanding the fact that certain shows are suited to national broadcast and others just to the local areas, so many of the artists reach a certain stage of development and they have to go to the larger cities to get further training. That is where all the really big, the majority of the major instructors and teachers are, in the major centres, and that is why the C.B.C. has their talent go to the larger centres, much as everyone likes to see home talent. There is a second point involved, and that is, if I might use the religious example -- a church might feel that it is suited to broadcast over our station and we have that experience, but as soon as they get the opportunity to go on the Dominion network they immediately augment their choir and perhaps combine three or four choirs and spend at least a month and a half preparing for the Dominion network origination. Now, actually, as far as that choir was concerned, in our area it was the same people listening over our station, but I think it is a mental approach. If you have an opportunity to address the Rotary Club in Moose Jaw you may put in X hours, but if you are invited to go down to Toronto and speak you may put in 50 hours in preparation. That is just one of the human problems we have to face.

MR. COYNE: Both a human and an economic

problem on your first point?

MR. BOYLING: Yes.

MR. COYNE: The artists are directed to the larger centres where they can expand their experience and make a better living.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your point is, they go to the larger centres not for the economic pull but to advance and improve their technique, their training?

MR. BOYLING: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Mrs. Oddie, turning to your final section where you are speaking of the effective link between public and private elements, about halfway down page 3 you say:

"The advertising industry itself must take
"cognizance of the fact that the Canadian
"public wants quality and variety in its
"television programming and not meaning-
"less and degrading forms of entertain-
"ment."

Are you suggesting at the present moment the Canadian public is suffering from meaningless and degrading forms of entertainment, or is this simply a note of caution, something that you wish to avoid in the future?

MRS. ODDIE: We certainly wish to avoid it in the future and we do feel that some of the present presentations are meaningless.

MR. COYNE: You say "some" but you would not want to characterize any large amount of the programming that you are receiving at the moment

as meaningless and degrading forms of entertainment? Is this a present factor in your consideration, or it something you are worried that may develop in the future?

MRS. ODDIE: It is a present factor in my opinion, that is, speaking personally as a radio listener.

MRS. JAMES: If I might speak on that, too: In our television conference considerable time was spent discussing the fact of these programmes of violence, the effect on children of these programmes of violence in television, and there was a good deal of concern about it. I do not know whether parents feel they are less able to control it on television than in movies or whether they feel that television should refuse to attempt it at all or at least control it much better than they do, but there was a good deal of concern. It was a large panel that discussed violence on television and the concern was quite acute and real as to how effective these presentations were, how it did affect children in their activities; and the result of the thing was that we felt there was very little that could be done about it.

MR. COYNE: Why was there very little that could be done about it?

MRS. JAMES: Well, outside of parents taking their own part in it and saying they could not look at it, you can tell them they cannot look at it but children are out in the afternoon and when you tell them they cannot look at it in their

own home they may be looking at it somewhere else. You do not want to be in the position of a parent saying that they cannot see this or that. They have to deal with it as a factor in children's lives and they prefer not to have it.

MR. COYNE: And it is a general criticism against broadcasting because I think a lot of these violence programmes that you speak of are, in fact, carried over the C.B.C. network, are they not?

MRS. JAMES: Yes, and the children also see a lot of the adult ones where there are gangsters and that sort of thing.

MR. BOYLING: On that same thing, I attended a clinic and we had a general discussion from the stage and then broke up into separate groups and I was in a different group to Mrs. James, and in our group there was the opposite -- there was a doctor associated with mental health as one of the members of our discussion group, and I gathered from him that it was not a problem, it was a stimulation and I am not qualified to repeat his general remarks, but both he and another doctor expressed the view that while there was violence, there is not the personal violence, somebody gets shot but it it not associated with violence, the man falls down but they know that in the next one he is going to be up again.

MR. COYNE: I have often wondered whether people have considered whether the violence appearing on The Lone Ranger, for instance, can hold a

candle to the violence in Grimm's Fairytales.

MR. BOYLING: One lady spoke to that and she spoke to the audience on this point. She said we were criticizing radio and T.V. programmes but her child had been sick one day and she took down one of her favourite fairy stories which she knew was a wonderful one because it was read to her as a child, and she said as an adult she read it through different eyes, and she had intended to skip parts of it but realized that as a child she had absorbed it, she absorbed it and that was that as far as that goes, and she could not see the seriousness of the criticism of T.V. and radio.

MRS. JAMES: I think the difference comes in the child's imagination as he listens to a fairy story. We have all had Grimm's fairy stories, that is all we had, but something that is put on a film, a picture, you look at it, you get a visual impression, you get one impression and the other impression is created for him on the film. It is one of the things that came out of the conference; there was a lady who told her children that they must not chew gum, that it was bad for their teeth, and the little boy goes to the dentist and says, "Dentyne is all right because on television it says it is all right." When the dentist asked the boy who said that, the boy told him it was a man in a white coat and he was a dentist too.

MRS. ODDIE: If I might add a personal experience, a friend who lived in a house where there

was a television set recently moved to her own home where there was not, and she told me how much difference it made to the children's rest at night. They would get all excited and built up watching television programmes and she told me that television was a very disturbing factor. She said the bed was always a tangle at night, and having been removed from the television set the boys were sleeping much better.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am afraid that is a fact that modern life and children will have to adopt. However, I will not get too far into the psychological effect because I am sure that it something the Commission will not find on. However, this has been very interesting and we are grateful to you, and I want to thank you for coming.

SUBMISSION OF BOTHWELL-HILL COMPANY LIMITED

APPEARANCES:

Mr. G.R. Bothwell.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief is from the Bothwell-Hill Co. Limited, an individual brief by Mr. George R. Bothwell. Mr. Bothwell, we will file your brief as Exhibit 61.

EXHIBIT NO. 61: Brief of Bothwell-Hill Co. Limited.

MR. BOTHWELL: Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to read the complete brief, but I would like to make this point in starting: That, unfortunately, there is no Sales and Advertising Club or Advertising Agency Association in this Province, and I am in a position where I feel that I would like to make a contribution of some of my ideas.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are very glad to have you come, and realize you are not approaching it from a point of view that is represented by any Association in this Province.

MR. BOTHWELL: I feel that there are a few main points that I might read at this time and I am referring to page 2 where I suggest that the present private television station should be required to provide a percentage of their profits to the C.B.C. so that the Corporation could proceed with the establishment of more C.B.C. television outlets. A strict financial accounting should be devised to provide the C.B.C. with the right to control

the expenditures made by private television stations to assure that accurate annual financial statements are made, and that a fair share of profit on investment is returned to the operators of private stations, and that all excess profits be turned over to the C.B.C. I think the same rules should also apply to private radio stations so that both radio and television broadcast dollars would be used to promote greater and better radio and television broadcasting across Canada. In other words, the C.B.C. should be strengthened in every way possible to make it an even better public utility than it is now. I have suggested in some more detail along that line. I feel, in dealing with the revenues of the Corporation, naturally it comes from advertisers, from the private radio and television stations as I have outlined and from a subsidy from the Treasury of the Government of Canada. I think the C.B.C. should be regarded as one of the most important public utilities in Canada. The people of the country in the past have approved subsidies of one kind and another and I feel that the C.B.C. is an important arm of democracy and the people will support the idea of subsidies. I am suggesting that in time it is likely, in my opinion, that the C.B.C. could become self-sustaining without subsidy. I would much prefer to have the judgment of a man like Mr. Davidson Dunton, the present General Manager of the C.B.C., in the operation of a public corporation such as this because I feel that he is moved by the

motive of service to the Canadian people, and that sort of interest and principle that a man like that has is of great importance. On the other hand, you have owners of radio and television stations and publishers who have only one motive, one main motive, and that is the profit motive.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am glad you put the extra qualification in because I think it is going too far to say there is only one motive.

MR. BOTHWELL: I do think that they attempt to provide some service, but they are always curtailed in the scope of the service by the monetary question.

I end up by suggesting, as a man who is in the advertising business, that Canadian advertisers are being placed in the position where their advertising dollar is being misused because the airwaves, both radio and television, are being saturated with advertising messages. I feel that the advertising industry is likely to suffer as will other fields of enterprise, private, public and co-operative, if this flagrant misuse of the radio and television media is allowed to continue.

Public confidence is necessary to achieve results from advertising. At the present time the slack regulations of the C.B.C. and the lack of foresight of many radio and television stations are likely to combine to destroy public confidence in broadcasting media. Advertisers and listeners should be protected by stringent regulations regarding the number of commercial messages in a given period and the length of advertising messages.

May I elaborate on that a bit, because I anticipate you may have a question or two there. I do feel that in placing advertisements on radio or television on behalf of a client I am far better off if I know that his advertising message is going to be isolated at the end of a programme without having to compete with a number of other advertising messages. The impact that that one particular message may make will be better for the advertiser. He will get more for his dollar if he does not have to compete with a number of different spots at the same time. I feel that in the self-interests of the advertising business and also of the radio and television industry it would be much better for them to either impose their own regulations on the number of commercials and the length of commercials, and if they don't do it, then, the C.B.C. or some regulatory body should see that it is imposed and enforced.

That is a very brief summary of the short brief I have submitted.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. As I said before, we appreciate your taking the trouble and interest to come and put forward points from a somewhat different point of view from the ones we have had.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Mr. Bothwell, I see through your brief at several different places you refer to "changes should be made to give greater authority to the public corporation": You can read that in several different paragraphs of your brief. Could you elaborate on this, please? What

do you exactly have in mind to give greater authority to the C.B.C.?

MR. BOTHWELL: Well, take one instance: I believe that there should be stricter regulations on this very question I spoke of latterly regarding spots and commercial messages. In other cases I feel that the C.B.C. -- there may be some general pattern laid down to indicate that there should be a greater number of programmes, as I suggest on page 3, greater effort to provide educational and cultural programmes, and I don't think that the present balance is weighed in favour of educational and cultural programmes as much as it should be. I think the C.B.C. could well step in and suggest to private stations that they do more of that sort of broadcasting, and also I feel that on the local level, as I suggest on page 3, there should be an attempt made to provide for more public forms of discussions on social economy and political subjects in order to have greater participation by our citizens in the practice of democracy. I don't think there is enough time devoted on the C.B.C. or private stations for that type of programme and that the C.B.C. could well lay down the policy that should be followed.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Yes, but this is quite different in some aspects: When you started to answer my question you touched the question of control and then you switched to the question of a different policy, which is something different altogether. I would like to take this matter of

control up with you again: Do you suggest that the C.B.C. does not have the necessary powers at present to control, or do you suggest that the C.B.C., having the power to control, does not exercise this power?

MR. BOTHWELL: I have not studied the regulations under which the C.B.C. operates, and I am not absolutely sure of all the aspects of the rules and regulations that govern, but I do feel that I am familiar with some of the rules and regulations, and I do feel they do relax on some of them; I know they have relaxed on the question of spots, for example. Sometime ago the number of spots permitted in a certain time period was limited. The C.B.C. recently, within the last two years, allowed a greater number of spots -- greater flexibility.

MR. deGRANDPRE: So you are giving to us the impression of a viewer who is not a specialist in the regulations, and you feel you get too much of a commercial impact while you are listening to or viewing a broadcast; is that a fair summary of your answer?

MR. BOTHWELL: Yes.

MR. deGRANDPRE: A little further down, just the next paragraph on page 2, you say that the C.B.C. should immediately embark on a plan to establish television stations in areas not yet served by public or private stations, and a little later on in your brief, for instance, you say that the Canadian television has been far too slow to

develop in Canada. Now, I will be quite frank with you and say that that is the first time I have heard that television has expanded slowly in Canada. Could you tell me why you reach this conclusion, because everybody else seems to agree that we have used seven-league boots to reach the position where we are today?

MR. BOTHWELL: Well, I meant the impression from the C.A.R.T.B. brief that they didn't think we were going as fast as we should; the private stations, for some reason or other, had not been able to go as fast, either through the fact that the C.B.C. was rather slow in granting them licenses, or through the fact that the private stations could not get the necessary capital to go ahead. I feel that the Federal Government -- preferably the Federal Government -- should have provided greater funds for the C.B.C. to expand at a faster rate.

MR. deGRANDPRE: But do you have in mind that the areas which are not yet served should be served by C.B.C. facilities or by private station facilities?

MR. BOTHWELL: Personally, I feel they should be served by C.B.C.

MR. deGRANDPRE: So when you say that the C.B.C. should immediately embark, you actually mean the C.B.C. and you are not infusing the C.B.C. with the Government policy as to the number of stations that should be licensed, or whether they should be licensed -- you really mean the

Corporation itself?

MR. BOTHWELL: Yes, definitely, and I think I do suggest that no further private T.V. stations should be allowed.

MR. deGRANDPRE: None at all; that they have reached the maximum number now at 26 or 28, and they should not be allowed any other?

MR. BOTHWELL: Well, I think that is correct, that there should not be any more because I feel the whole broadcasting industry, certainly the television industry, is one that should be a public utility in much the same manner as the Ontario Hydro or the Saskatchewan Park Commission.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Why do you make a difference between the television system and the sound system where private stations have been allowed to spread all over the country?

MR. BOTHWELL: I think it is an accomplished fact that the radio industry is pretty well established, and I don't suppose there are going to be too many more private radio stations. There may be, but you cannot upset an industry that has been operating in so many centres for so long a time.

MR. deGRANDPRE: But since the radio -- and I am talking now of a policy to be followed; the policy for broadcasting has been to serve the whole of Canada by a chain of publicly and privately-owned stations, and now on the television score you prefer to develop slowly by publicly-

owned corporations?

MR. BOTHWELL: Right.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Do you have any criticism to offer as to the end result of the radio policy?

MR. BOTHWELL: You mean the existing radio system as we have it now?

MR. deGRANDPRE: Yes. If you are against the policy which was adopted for radio, you must have reasons for preferring a new policy and I would like your views on that.

MR. BOTHWELL: I think I have suggested them in the brief, and that is, that both radio and T.V. in my opinion should be publicly-owned, and, again, to refer to this question of a greater emphasis on non-commercial programmes: I again go back to that, that I feel there is too much emphasis in the private radio and even in C.B.C.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Let us take your last statement, for reducing the commercial side of broadcasting; if I read your brief in the light of your last statement, I have some trouble. You say you want to reduce the advertising on one hand and then, on page 3, the third paragraph, you say, "In time it is more than likely that the C.B.C. could become self-sustaining". How do you think this can be achieved?

MR. BOTHWELL: Well, I would presume that in the development of the publicly-owned television set-up that they are naturally going to be businessmen enough to have enough commercial programmes

to pay the way. That means, possibly -- and I think in view of what I have said -- that advertising rates will undoubtedly have to go up. The advertisers in the end will have to foot the bill, and I think it is perfectly proper that they should do so.

MR. deGRANDPRE: On this score we were told that at present national advertisers were not footing the bill because the cost of producing programmes was higher than the amount of money that the Corporation could receive from the sponsor.

MR. BOTHWELL: Yes.

MR. deGRANDPRE: If you add to that the fact you want to increase the non-commercial programmes -- educational programmes and forums and public discussion and things like that -- are we not by the same token going to increase again the over-all cost of production and thereby make the national programmes so unattractive to a sponsor that you will not find a sponsor?

MR. BOTHWELL: I would like to suggest that in the next few years there will be, in my opinion, a levelling off and a down-grading of the costs of production of television programmes. I feel that in what might be termed this experimental stage, just as in radio, the costs are always high to start with on an experimental basis, and I feel that the production costs of the spots have already started to go down, because people in the industry are finding new techniques and new ways of reducing costs in the production of a spot, and over

the years I would suggest there will be a reduction in the costs of production of advertising messages and all programmes. Now, that will answer part of your question, I believe, sir.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Yes, but do you think that by reducing the cost you will be able to cover the extra price that you will have to pay on the over-all picture taking into account that you are going to reduce drastically the amount of commercial sponsorship?

MR. BOTHWELL: Well, how do you know what is going to happen?

MR. deGRANDPRE: Well, you have not made any special analysis of what could be reduced here and increased there?

MR. BOTHWELL: No, it still has to be developed, and you will find the answers as you go.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Still on page 3 of your brief you refer to a policy of the C.B.C. on confidential issues and you describe it as, "The C.B.C. should abandon its hyper-sensitive attitudes about offending politicians or pressure groups. The C.B.C. should realize that 'one broadcast must present <u>both</u> sides of an argument' is not a cardinal rule of broadcasting. The C.B.C. seems to think that there must be both sides of an argument presented in every case ...": We have heard a lot of criticism about the C.B.C. trying to muzzle the opinion of some group, and this criticism has even arisen after a policy of presenting both sides of

a story; so, don't you think this is a proper safeguard for the public that there should at all times always be both sides of a story being put before the listeners?

MR. BOTHWELL: My feeling there is that that is not necessary; it is not axiomatic that there are two sides to a story. I am sure the Commissioners have got special ideas on the different sides of the broadcasting industry, but there seems to be a tendency in my viewing and listening for the C.B.C. to say, "Well, there is the pro and the con and that is all," but they do not take into consideration ---

MR. deGRANDPRE: You mean a middle course is never taken; is that what you suggest?

MR. BOTHWELL: Well, you seem to get the feeling, that is my impression, that it is pro and con rather than a many-sided question -- particularly in some of the forum broadcasts.

THE CHAIRMAN: I was taking from this that the basis of your suggestion here, and what you were trying to ask for, was that instead of having "pro and con" you would have either "pro" or "con".

MR. BOTHWELL: I don't see anything the matter with that, either. If one idea is presented at one time it does not immediately say that on the same programme you have to have a con idea.

MR. deGRANDPRE: But isn't this the result -- and I am also referring to another suggestion we have received on which I would like to

have your thoughts -- it has been suggested that most of these forum public discussion programmes are limited to 30 minutes, and before the subject is presented to the audience, and before the 4 members of the panel have given their little bit, that there is practically left no substantial amount of time for each member of the panel to really give a fair expose of what he thinks the problem is, and that the time element is responsible in some measure for this impression that you get as a viewer, and the suggestion was made that it could probably be increased in the case of these forums, that the time allowed for these forums could be increased to 45 or 60 minutes and thereby remove the impression that you, as a listener, have received. Would you think that this would be still a fair approach, trying to give both sides on the same programme, instead of giving one side this week and not listening to the other side for perhaps four weeks, and sometimes the listener could miss that particular programme and would not get the other side at all?

MR. BOTHWELL: My feeling is that the last three minutes of these forum broadcasts are the most interesting, and if they could put the panel on the air, at least indicate to the panel that they are on the air ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Fool the panel into thinking they are on the air and get them warmed up?

MR. BOTHWELL: Yes, get them warmed up

because you are left hanging when they are just getting interesting at the end of a programme.

MR. deGRANDPRE: The last question that I have is in connection with this view that you have expressed, that there is too much of a good thing on television or too much of a bad thing, about advertising. Do you feel that the length of the advertising spot is too long, or do you feel that this advertising is repeated too often? What I have in mind is this: You could have the same number of spots during any given time, but you would have less time for these advertisements; are you thinking in terms of reducing the time per spot or the number of them?

MR. BOTHWELL: The number of spots, I think, and I think there should be a limit on the time of the spot, and I think a good advertiser realizes that he is further ahead.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: There is a limit to the number of spots and the limit of the time that the spot can take.

THE CHAIRMAN: On this point you are on now, as I take it you are speaking really as a man interested in the advertising business?

MR. BOTHWELL: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: And your point is, because of what you call the saturation of advertising messages today, that that is a bad thing for the advertising business?

MR. BOTHWELL: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: And you go on to say that advertisers and listeners should be protected by strengthened regulations as to these particulars, and so on; there are restrictions now but you say they should be strengthened?

MR. BOTHWELL: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: And is that the only way that this objective can be obtained? Just let me give you one point: You take the method of more strengthened regulations; well, accepting your terms for the purpose of argument that the present saturation or over-saturation of advertising methods is going to deter the purpose of advertising, is it not automatically correct, if you are right in your premise that so much advertising is driving listeners away or viewers away and is going to make people turn to other forms of advertising media -- then, automatically, by the fear of competition for the advertising dollar, will not the radio and television have to adjust itself and reduce its spots and the length of spots and nature of advertising and this other saturation?

MR. BOTHWELL: Yes, I agree with that, but I do feel that at present they have had twenty years or more of radio, radio stations are doing all right but they are still subjecting their listeners to too many spots. The C.B.C., as I suggested earlier, recently relaxed some of their regulations and I think that was a bad step to relax those regulations.

THE CHAIRMAN: But apparently it has not, from your premise here, it has not done any injury as yet to the business of advertising?

MR. BOTHWELL: No, it has not. But I suggest that every industry must regulate itself or it should be regulated or they are going to suffer in the long run.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would think that after twenty years the suffering would have started by now.

MR. BOTHWELL: Some radio stations are suffering.

THE CHAIRMAN: But will they not automatically correct that if they are? They are competent businessmen.

MR. BOTHWELL: Possibly, yes.

MR. deGRANDPRE: That is all, thank you.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: I would like to ask you a few questions on the rather unique method of financing that you are proposing on page 2 of your brief; this is something we have never seen before. On page 2 you say:

"The present private television stations
"should be required to provide a per-
"centage of their profits to the C.B.C.
"so that the Corporation could proceed
"with the establishment of more C.B.C.
"television outlets."

Now, that is rather a unique suggestion in that you are going to -- you are apparently suggesting that television stations should be treated

differently from any other corporation. Today, a corporation, if they are making profits, have to pay income tax, but you are going to superimpose an additional tax on them. I would just like to know what your thinking was in that respect, how you have reached this decision or made this suggestion, rather?

MR. BOTHWELL: Well, my basic idea is that television should be a public utility. Now, we already have private stations and in order to let them keep operating and running, taking them over -- which I do not think the C.B.C. or anybody would want to do --but you have got to get some revenue from somewhere, and why should these private stations get a lot of the cream that the C.B.C. could well use in the development of public television across the country? I have suggested that there is room for private T.V. operators to get a reasonable profit; I do not think it is necessary for them to get any more than a reasonable profit out of their investment.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Of course, we have not seen any statements yet, so we cannot say whether they are getting an exhorbitant profit or a reasonable profit, but it seems rather strange that you should suggest that they should be treated somewhat differently to any other profit-making body in the country. I rather suspect that you might feel that through the feeding of certain C.B.C. programmes to these private stations to the effect that they were being subsidized to some extent by the C.B.C., I thought that was in your mind, and if it

had been I was going to say that when Mr. Dunton appeared on the stand in Ottawa that question was put before him and he would not agree that the private stations were being subsidized because they were providing an outlet to C.B.C. for the dissemination of the programmes which they thought were in the national interest. I think the private stations are equally satisfied that they are not being subsidized by the C.B.C. I have never heard that -- they are subsidizing the C.B.C. by giving them programmes, they feel there is a mutual satisfactory arrangement there, but I just wanted to find out what you had in mind because I thought you had the idea that there was some form of subsidization there.

MR. BOTHWELL: No, I left out that particular point, but I might suggest, now that the subsidy question has been raised, that actually I do feel that there is a form of subsidization regarding news in that the C.B.C. in its news set-up is providing a service to the private stations.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: I think probably either you are wrong or I have the wrong impression because I think all these private stations have their own teletype systems in there to gather news, and I imagine they pay for that and they have to pay their own editorial staff to summarize their news for their broadcasts. I think that is correct.

MR. BOTHWELL: Yes, they do have news staffs, but I think they would be larger if it were

not for the C.B.C. set-up.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: That I do not know but I would say there would be more agreement on both sides as between the C.B.C. and private stations and there is no method of subsidization at all.

MR. BOTHWELL: No, not in monetary terms.

THE CHAIRMAN: You will agree with this suggestion Mr. Stewart has been asking you about, Mr. Bothwell, that you are really embarking or suggesting -- embarking on a pretty difficult operation there, far apart from the normal taxation system in Canada and extremely difficult from the standpoint of determining what is a fair profit and what is a reasonable profit and so forth. This is not, surely, the kind of operation we have in the past found was a good method of doing things.

MR. BOTHWELL: Well, I suggest that it might well be a solution in the future that a publicly-owned utility like the C.B.C., now that there are private stations, you cannot get rid of the private stations, we have got to find some way of getting some of the revenue that the private stations are receiving.

THE CHAIRMAN: They are getting it back now; if they make profits approximately 50% of the profits goes right back into the public Treasury, and if you then make grants through the public Treasury to the C.B.C., some of the profits will be coming to it.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: I think it has

been plain to us even by the C.B.C. that these private stations did supplement the national system and are of value to the C.B.C. If they are not there the C.B.C., by reason of the task that has been given to them, must have to build stations itself at considerable cost to the taxpayer for capital and probably operate at a loss, again the taxpayer's money. I think the C.B.C. are perfectly clear on that point, that private stations do supplement and help them in their objective.

MR. BOTHWELL: Yes, but I do not think that a privately-owned station -- Mr. Chairman, you said that 50% of the excess profits might go back into the public Treasury?

THE CHAIRMAN: It does.

MR. BOTHWELL: I suggest that the 50%, if that is the figure, shall we say 5%, 6% or 7% return on investment is a fair return, why should not everything above the 5%, 6% or 7 or 8% profit -- if these private radio and T.V. people are in the business as a public service, say, and I think they are, they should be set aside with a return of so much on their investment.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: I do not know how much they are getting, I would think some of them are losing money.

MR. BOTHWELL: Possibly.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have no evidence to produce before us that there are excessive or exhorbitant profits in private stations, have you?

MR. BOTHWELL: I do not think that their financial statements are made public, at least, I have never seen any.

THE CHAIRMAN: But your suggestion would be, using your 5%, 6% or 7% figure that you mentioned -- you take it that this is one industry for this kind of limitation on profits without extending it to others?

MR. BOTHWELL: Yes, because of the nature and the importance of television and radio as both a cultural and educational media in the country.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for coming to give us your brief, and for taking the trouble to prepare it.

MR. BOTHWELL: Thank you, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think there is any point in our starting another brief. I do not know how fast the transport and commissariat departments are going to work today, but we will try to get back and start at 2.15, and if we are a few minutes late you will just have to excuse us. We will adjourn now.

---The hearing adjourned at 12:45 P.M. until 2:15 P.M.

THE CHAIRMAN: The first brief we will have this afternoon will be from L'Association Catholique Franco-Canadienne de Saskatchewan presented by Mr. Dumont Lepage. We will mark this brief as Exhibit 62.

EXHIBIT NO. 62: Brief submitted by l'Association Catholique Franco-Canadienne de Saskatchewan.

SUBMISSION BY L'ASSOCIATION CATHOLIQUE FRANCO-CANADIENNE DE SASKATCHEWAN.

APPEARANCES:

M. Dumont LePage

M. DUMONT LEPAGE: Monsieur le président, après avoir assisté aux assises de ce matin, je réalise pleinement que les mémoires ont été longs. Je me limiterai à vous donner l'introduction de notre mémoire et je passerai à quelques autres considérations pour arriver ensuite aux conclusions.

Monsieur le président, messieurs. La question de la radiodiffusion et de la télévision ne saurait échapper à la vigilance de l'Etat, étant donné son influence sur la culture et les moeurs des citoyens qui composent leur auditoire.

La télévision, tout comme la radio, comporte, en effet, une valeur éducative et cultur-

elle, une valeur d'information, une valeur de divertissement, et, enfin, une valeur accidentelle commerciale.

Le Gouvernement canadien avait donc raison de conclure dès le début de la radio chez nous que "si la radiodiffusion voulait stimuler la vie canadienne, au lieu de l'affaiblir, un organisme public et national devait être constitué".

La Société Radio-Canada est née de cette conclusion. Telle qu'elle est constituée présentement, elle résulte de deux Commissions Royales (Aird et Massey) et d'une quinzaine de Comités parlementaires.

Mais voici que l'avènement de la télévision pose de nouveau le problème en regard de la prospérité et du développement culturel du pays, chose prévue par la Commission Massey qui recommandait que "toute la question de la télévision au Canada soit étudiée de nouveau, par un organisme d'enquête indépendant, au plus tard trois ans après le début des émissions régulières de télévision au Canada".

Le décret du 2 décembre 1955 émanant du Cabinet du Premier Ministre institue la Commission Fowler pour poursuivre cette enquête.

Désireuse de collaborer, pour sa part, à une démarche si opportune, l'Association Catholique Franco-Canadienne de la Saskatchewan croit de son devoir de présenter le présent mémoire au nom des 50,000 Canadiens français qu'elle représente.

Dès l'avénement de la radio au Canada, l'ACFC se fit l'interprète des groupes de langue française des provinces de l'Ouest et réclama énergiquement un pourcentage raisonnable de programmes français.

Lors de la fondation du poste d'Etat de

Watrous, on nous accorda une heure de français par jour, ce qui était manifestement insuffisant.

Les Associations d'Education des Provinces des Prairies, y compris l'ACFC, s'unirent alors pour étudier plus à fond tout le problème; d'où la fondation de Radio-Ouest-Française.

Radio-Ouest-Française ayant reconnu que la seule solution était la fondation, à nos frais, de nos propres postes de radio française, en Saskatchewan l'initiative en revint à l'ACFC qui la conduisit à bon port en rendant possible l'établissment de deux postes, soit CFRG, ouvert à Gravelbourg, le 2 juin 1952, et CFNS, ouvert à Saskatoon, le 30 novembre 1952.

Dès le début, collaboration étroite; nos postes répondent au voeu de la Commission Massey et offrent à Radio-Canada le moyen de la réaliser: "Que la radiodiffusion, au Canada, soit l'expression des idées et des aspirations canadiennes et atteigne le plus grand nombre possible de Canadiens".

En effet, avec les postes des provinces-soeurs, CKSB à St-Boniface et CHFA à Edmonton, les deux postes de la Saskatchewan, CFRG et CFNS, se sont faits les interprètes des idées et des aspirations canadiennes en notre milieu par le niveau élevé de leurs programmes culturels; bientôt d'ailleurs, ils allaient être reconnus par la Société Radio-Canada comme un moyen précieux d'atteindre tous les groupes canadiens-français des Provinces des Prairies.

Le 26 octobre 1952, année de la fondation de nos postes de la Saskatchewan, la Société Radio-Canada, respectant la constitution bi-ethnique du pays et reconnaissant l'effort des canadiens-français au delà du Québec, consacrait le fait français en nos Provinces en étendant son réseau français à

l'Ontario-Nord et jusqu'aux Rocheuses.

Je passe maintenant à certaines appréhensions qu'entretient l'ACFC.

Devant les tendances commercialisantes de nombre de sociétés radiophoniques privées, l'ACFC ne peut se défendre de graves appréhensions quant au maintien du niveau culturel des programmes. Ce point de vue devrait primer, il nous semble, toute entreprise du genre, étant donné la puissance de formation de la radio sur les groupes disséminés dans toutes les régions de notre vaste pays et pour lesquels elle est un centre de ralliement tant pour la formation civique que culturelle.

Or, un trop grand nombre de postes privés supportent mal la tutelle de l'Etat qu'ils considèrent comme une entrave à leur appétit de gain. C'est pourtant le devoir de l'Etat de promouvoir la culture civique et populaire, de veiller à la moralité des services nationaux et de sauvegarder, dans cette éducation, la hiérarchie des valeurs, donnant la primauté aux valeurs spirituelles sur les valeurs matérielles.

Nos conclusions: Nous avons déjà rappelé, au début et au paragraphe précédent de ce mémoire, la valeur de la radiodiffusion et de la télévision dans l'édification de la nation canadienne.

Cette valeur touche divers domaine qui n'ont pas tous le même degré d'importance. En premier lieu vient la valeur éducative et culturelle; en deuxième lieu, la valeur d'information et en troisième celle de divertissement. La valeur commerciale ne vient qu'en dernier lieu et n'est qu'accidentelle à cette question de télévision et de radio, en autant que l'annonce constitue une source

de revenus qui doit contribuer au perfectionnement des programmes exprimant les valeurs de culture, d'information et de divertissement.

Il est donc très important que la télévision et la radiodiffusion demeurent un service national de l'Etat dont les droits se formulent ainsi:

L'Etat a un droit propre et un devoir de procurer l'éducation civique et populaire de ses citoyens. Pour appuyer cette affirmation il suffira de citer la parole autorisée de S.S. Pie XI, dans l'Encyclique sur l'Education: "De plus, en général, la société civile et l'Etat sont en droit de revendiquer ce qu'on peut appeler l'éducation civique, non seulement de la jeunesse, mais encore de tous les âges et de toutes les conditions. Cette éducation consiste dans l'art de présenter publiquement à la raison, à l'imagination, aux sens de l'individu vivant en société, des objets qui soient de nature à provoquer la volonté au bien ou à l'y conduire par une sorte de nécessité morale, soit positivement, dans la manière même de les présenter, soit négativement, dans les moyens employés pour écarter ce qui leur serait contraire."

L'Etat a un droit de surveillance et de protection de la morale; surveillance du vrai et du bien et, en ce sens, il doit protéger les citoyens en des institutions de sources d'information véridique et de sains divertissements. Pour citer à nouveau Pie XI: "L'Etat peut exiger, et, dès lors, faire en sorte que tous les citoyens aient la connaissance nécessaire de leurs devoirs civiques et nationaux, puis un certain degré de culture intellectuelle, morale et physique, qui, vu les conditions de notre temps, est vraiment requis pour

le bien commun".

L'intérêt commercial de l'industrie ne pourra jamais supplanter ni même remplacer l'Etat dans l'accomplissement de ces deux devoirs de l'éducation civique et morale. Déjà la Commission Massey l'a fait remarquer: "c'est une supposition erronée qu'au Canada la radiodiffusion est une industrie".

L'intention commerciale ne peut donc pas être placée sur un pied d'égalité avec la préoccupation culturelle, ni entrer en concurrence avec elle. Elle doit lui demeurer subordonnée.

En conséquence, L'A.C.F.C. recommande:

Que, tant dans le domaine de la télévision que dans celui de la radiodiffusion, les droits de régie de l'Etat soient respectés et maintenus en vigueur afin de garder ces instruments de culture à l'abri de toute commercialisation excessive.

Que la Société Radio-Canada continue à alléger le fardeau financier des postes établis par les nôtres au prix de grands sacrifices, afin de leur permettre, n'étant plus esclaves de la réclame commerciale, de consacrer davantage leurs ressources aux programmes de culture, selon l'objectif même de la Société: "Créer un certain climat dont l'effet général sera de développer et de stimuler l'intelligence des personnes, jeunes et âgées, qui, semaine après semaine et année après année y auront été exposées." Ce sont les paroles de M. Dunton dans son rapport au Comité parlementaire sur la Radio, 1953).

Que, étant donné l'inappréciable contribution de la Société Radio-Canada à la culture canadienne et principalement pour garder à cette culture son caractère national et distinctif en opposition aux programmes américanisants, des subsides

encore plus généreux que par le passé lui soient accordés par le Gouvernement canadien.

En terminant ce mémoire, l'Association Catholique Franco-Canadienne de la Saskatchewan émet respectueusement le voeu que:

Etant donné le développement de la télévision au pays et le facteur de culture qu'elle représente, des mesures soient prises pour que Radio-Canada soit le plus tôt possible, en mesure d'offrir ce service national à nos compatriotes de l'Ouest canadien qui sont d'expression française.

Et que le réseau français de Radio-Canada soit étendu aussitôt que possible jusqu'à la Côte du Pacifique pour permettre à nos compatriotes d'origine française de la Province de Colombie de communier en leur langue et selon leurs traditions à ce bien commun de la télévision et de la radiodiffusion, pour leur permettre aussi d'y participer activement et d'apporter ainsi, en leur qualité de Canadiens "quelque chose de distinctif à l'humanité" (M. Dunton au Richelieu-Québec) et afin qu'en ce domaine comme dans tous les autres, soit réalisée la devise du Canada "A MARI USQUE AD MARE".

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Lepage.

Me JEAN deGRANDPRE: Vous nous avez indiqué tout à l'heure que la population des Canadiens-français de la Saskatchewan était de 50,000 environ?

M. LEPAGE: 52,852 ou 52,582, je ne suis pas certain.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce que vous pouvez dire si tous font partie de l'Association?

M. LEPAGE: L'Association représente

tous les Canadiens-français de la Saskatchewan. Maintenant, ça ne veut pas nécessairement dire que tous les Canadiens-français y prennent une part active.

Me deGRANDPRE: Ca représente à peu près quel pourcentage de la population totale?

M. LEPAGE: 6.1 ou 6.2.

Me deGRANDPRE: Vous indiquez que la Société Radio-Canada, à la page 11 de votre mémoire "continue à alléger le fardeau financier des postes établis par les nôtres". Pouvez-vous m'indiquer dans quelle mesure la Société Radio-Canada a jusqu'à date allégé le fardeau de vos postes de l'Ouest?

M. LEPAGE: D'abord, par l'extension du réseau français, qui nous permet de diffuser des programmes très bien montés que vous avez dans l'Est. Nous servons en fait de débouchés pour Radio-Canada pour le réseau français dans le centre de la province, comme le poste du nord sert de débouché pour le réseau français pour lequel nous recevons une rémunération de $6.00 de l'heure; et notre taux de tarif est de $40.00 de l'heure. Cet argent-là ne fait que nous aider à rencontrer nos dépenses.

Me deGRANDPRE: Et cet arrangement, est-ce qu'il est spécial pour la Saskatchewan ou s'il s'applique partout pour les quatre postes du réseau français dans les provinces de l'Ouest?

M. LEPAGE: Je crois que c'est particulier à la Saskatchewan. Est-ce que je peux ajouter là-dessus? Vous êtes passés au Manitoba. On vous a dit là sans doute que la population du Manitoba était de 66,000. La population française du Manitoba est groupée surtout autour de Saint-Boniface, et ils ont Winnipeg qui est considérée comme la barrière de

l'Ouest canadien, comme marché, où la population est de deux à trois cents mille, où le marché est plus considérable que la Saskatchewan. Nous, en Saskatchewant, nous avons deux postes à faire vivre avec une population de 52,000. Malgré tout, ces postes ont été bâtis par des contributions, c'est-à-dire que les Canadiens-français ont contribué et payé comptant $158,500 pour bâtir le poste de Gravelbourg.

Me deGRANDPRE: Nous avons eu ces renseignements à Winnipeg; c'est pour cela que je ne demande pas de les répéter. Mais si, à certains moments c'est nécessaire, vous pourrez indiquer les points que vous voulez faire ressortir. Quand vous dites que la valeur d'une heure dans votre poste est de $40.00, c'est dans le cas où vous vendez à un commanditaire une heure?

M. LEPAGE: Oui.

Me deGRANDPRE: Dans un cas comme celui-là, je comprends que le poste a également des dépenses pour créer l'heure qu'il présente pour le commanditaire?

M. LEPAGE: C'est-à-dire que la plupart des programmes du réseau sont divisés en segments de quinze minutes. Pour les commanditaires nous passons des fois des Spots qui sont reliés au programme. Comme pour le programme de Robin Hood, nous devons passer nous-mêmes l'annonce. Nous devons avoir un annonceur.

Me deGRANDPRE: Cette annonce que vous recevez est vendue au bénéfice du poste?

M. LEPAGE: Nous ne recevons rien d'aucun 'commercial' qui vient de Radio-Canada. Si Radio-Canada vend 'Un homme et son péché" c'est Radio-Canada qui garde les revenus, et nous passons les

programmes commerciaux pour $6.00 d l'heure.

M. TURCOTTE: Y compris les programmes de soutien qui ne donnent rien à Radio-Canada?

M. LEPAGE: Oui.

M. TURCOTTE: $6.00 de l'heure pour des programmes de soutien et des programmes commerciaux?

M. LEPAGE: Oui, c'est ça.

Me deGRANDPRE: Maintenant, vous suggérez dans ce même paragraphe que dessubsides plus généreux soient accordés aux postes. Est-ce que vous avez élaboré une formule de subsides à laquelle les postes de la Saskatchewan, pour le moment, ont pensé?

M. LEPAGE: Avez-vous dit aux postes ou à Radio-Canada?

Me deGRANDPRE: Dans votre mémoire, vous dites que Radio-Canada devrait vous aider davantage. Est-ce que vous avez, dans ce sens-là, élaboré une formule?

M. LEPAGE: Pour vous répondre directement, je dois répondre non; excepté que nous envisageons des possibilités d'améliorer nos programmes locaux, mais nous ne pouvons pas le faire à cause de nos finances qui sont très précaires.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce que vous pensez à cette aide additionnelle comme devant être soit une augmentation de la rémunération que vous recevez par heure lorsque vous diffusez des programmes, ou si vous pensez plutôt à un subside sous forme d'octroi global, une fois par année ou tous les six mois? Selon quelle formule avez-vous envisagé l'aide financière que vous désirez recevoir de Radio-Canada?

M. LEPAGE: Plutôt sous la forme d'octroi global, considérant les services que nous leur rendons.

Me deGRANDPRE: Je comprends que le poste sera entendu après vous. Il y a certaines questions que je demanderai au représentant du poste. En général, est-ce que vous avez l'impression que les programmes que vous recevez du réseau français rencontrent les exigences du milieu ou si vous les trouvez trop élevés au point de vue culturel? C'est une remarque qui nous a été faite à Winnipeg.

M. LEPAGE: Au début, nos auditeurs trouvaient que les programmes que nous recevions du réseau général étaient un peu élevés. Certainement, après trois ou quatre ans, les gens s'éduquent. Alors, nous avons beaucoup moins de critiques au sujet de ce facteur-là. Un autre facteur: c'est que Radio-Canada a réalisé le champ d'action qui existait ici et a modifié ses programmes pour faire un équilibre dans leurs émissions.

Me deGRANDPRE: D'après la première partie de votre réponse, je dois comprendre que la qualité supérieure des émissions qui vous étaient transmisses a réussi à élever substantiellement ou dans une proportion quelconque le niveau intellectuel de la masse de la population française de Saskatchewan?

M. LEPAGE: Oui.

Me deGRANDPRE: Et que, de son côté, Radio-Canada a baissé un peu son niveau et que là, vous êtes à peu près satisfaits du genre d'émissions que vous recevez?

M. LEPAGE: Oui, je crois qu'on peut s'accorder là-dessus.

Me deGRANDPRE: Vous ne croyez pas alors que le genre des programmes soit passé à Winnipeg, comme on nous l'a suggéré?

M. LEPAGE: Ca dépend quelle sorte de

programmes Radio-Canada pourrait réaliser. On peut nous arriver avec une émission qui serait mal comprise ou peu comprise ici.

Me deGRANDPRE: A date, c'est satisfaisant?

M. LEPAGE: Oui, on n'a pas trop à se plaindre. Il faut considérer aussi que notre population, en Saskatchewan, avait été vingt et quelques années sans entendre un seul mot de français à la Radio et, en 1942, après la Commission Aird, nous avons eu une heure de français à Watrous. Cette heure de français leur a donné l'avidité d'entendre la radio. Après avoir été si longtemps sans entendre de français à la radio, ils n'étaient pas trop exigeants.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce que les deux postes de la Saskatchewan ne diffusent seulement qu'en francais?

M. LEPAGE: Oui, entièrement.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce qu'il y a des programmes qui sont destinés à la population de langue anglaise?

M. LEPAGE: Non du tout.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce que vous pouvez dire si les postes ont tout de même un auditoire de langue anglaise?

M. LEPAGE: Oui. Nous avons ici une liasse de lettres dans lesquelles il y a plusieurs lettres de personnes de langue anglaise de Régina et d'ailleurs, des lettres d'appréciation de nos programmes.

Me deGRANDPRE: Je ne vois pas qu'il soit nécessaire de déposer ces lettres pour le moment.

M. TURCOTTE: Quel est le genre des programmes qui plaisent particulièrement aux auditeurs qui ne sont pas de langue française? Program-

mes musicaux?

M. LEPAGE: En voici une de Régina: "Manager, Radio Station, Gravelburg. Dear Sir: I should like to express my appreciation of the musical programs which are available at all times from your station. I also appreciate the French newscasts as I am trying to brush up my High School French. It is a great comfort to be able to tune in Gravelburg and know that good music rather than popular tunes are always available. I am English speaking and Protestant so you may appreciate how much I enjoy your program since my letter is completely unsolicited. Thanking you for many happy hours."

C'en est une; et j'en ai d'autres.

Me deGRANDPRE: Vous savez que les programmes sont écoutés parce que vous recevez des lettres d'appréciation, mais vous n'avez jamais fait de relevés pour indiquer quel pourcentage de vos auditeurs sont des auditeurs de langue anglaise?

M. LEPAGE: Non, nous n'avons jamais fait aucun sondage.

Me deGRANDPRE: Vous avez dit tout à l'heure que le poste opérait 60 heures par semaine sur le réseau?

M. LEPAGE: Oui.

Me deGRANDPRE: Ce qui laisse combien d'heures pour la production locale?

M. LEPAGE: Quarante-deux heures.

Me deGRANDPRE: Vous opérez cent deux heures par semaine?

M. LEPAGE: Quand je vous dis cela, nous parlons de CFRG, à Gravelbourg. L'autre poste français du nord, je ne sais pas s'il opère cent ou cent deux ou cent quatre heures. Je suis gérant du

poste de Gravelbourg aussi.

THE CHAIRMAN: I take it from a couple of points that you read that in your view the commercial values of radio and television are definitely, as you put it, "accidental and supplementary" to the other values?

MR. LEPAGE: Yes, the same as food is necessary to live.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am not sure I would call food an accidental value, but it is true, from reading your brief, it would be a fair conclusion to draw that in your thinking the cultural and educational values, informative values, and so on, were prior to and superior to the commercial value of the medium.

MR. LEPAGE: Correct, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. The part that you have not read, we have read, and it does support both your conclusions and your submissions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Next we are to hear from la Société Radio-Gravelbourg Limitée. Dr. Rosario Morin and Mr. Dumont Lepage.

We will first mark this brief as Exhibit No. 63.

EXHIBIT NO. 63: Brief submitted by La Société Radio-Gravelbourg Limitée.

SUBMISSION BY LA SOCIETE RADIO-GRAVELBOURG LIMITEE.

APPEARANCES:

Dr. Rosario Morin

DR. ROSARIO MORIN: Monsieur le président, messieurs les Commissaires. Notre mémoire est assez long; je n'en donnerai qu'un résumé.

Nous approuvons de Radio-Canada en principe et dans son travail pratique. La radiodiffusion doit continuer d'être l'expression des idées et des aspirations canadiennes et atteindre le plus grand nombre possible de Canadiens. La distribution des programmes canadiens par un organisme public doit demeurer l'aspect principal du principe de la radiodiffusion au Canada.

Les directeurs et les souscripteurs de notre poste CFRG ne retirent aucun avantage financier

de notre entreprise. Notre unique intérêt dans la radio et la télévision est culturel et éducationnel.

Pour l'avenir de la nation canadienne la radiodiffusion ne doit pas être uniquement un instrument d'information, de divertissement et de publicité. Mais la radiodiffusion doit avoir une valeur éducationnelle et culturelle.

Nous nous opposons à une solution totalitaire comme elle existe en Russie. Nous nous opposons à la solution commerciale, thèse prônée concorde avec la Commission Massey qui dit: "Le principal grief des propriétaires privés se fonde, croyons-nous, sur la supposition erronée qu'au Canada la radiodiffusion est une industrie".

Nous n'admettons pas qu'il existe un droit reconnu de participer à la radiodiffusion en tant qu'industrie, ni que ceux qui y ont engagé des fonds jouissent d'un statut autre que celui de participants au régime national.

La liberté absolue des postes privés serait catastrophique. Les postes ont toujours négligé le point de vue national. Malgré tous nos efforts les Canadiens français n'ont jamais obtenu de français aux postes privés.

Négligence au point de vue culturel. Il s'agit d'écouter ce que nous servent les postes privés non rattachés au réseau. Le rapport de la Commission Massey confirme cet état de choses: "Nous avons observé, toutefois, que quelques-uns des postes privés, les plus riches, ont les plus piètres émissions et négligent gravement leurs obligations en tant que partie du régime national.

Négligence du point de vue culturel canadien. La liberté absolue aux postes privés amèner-

ait une annexion culturelle progressive aux Etats-Unis. C'est d'ailleurs ce que dit la Commission Aird: "Actuellement la plupart des programmes proviennent de sources extra-canadiennes. On a insisté auprès de nous pour nous faire entendre que la réception continuelle de ce genre de programmes tend à modifier la mentalité de la jeunesse de chez nous, de façon à lui inculquer un idéal et des opinions qui ne sont pas canadiens."

A cause du coût de la télévision, le danger est encore plus grand. Comme le dit M. Dunton: "Tant qu'il coûtera beaucoup moins cher pour importer une émission coûteuse que pour produire ici le programme le plus simple, la tendance sera toujours à l'importation".

La conclusion: la télévision et la radio canadiennes mises sur une base commerciale, tendent á devenir de moins en moins canadiennes.

Solution: Nous approuvons la solution du rapport Aird, améliorée par le rapport Massey, approuvée par le Parlement canadien, établissant le régime national actuel.

Arguments en faveur de cette solution:

Droit propre de l'Etat en fonction de son droit d'éducation civique. La radiodiffusion et la télévision sont nécessairement instruments d'éducation civique et de culture nationale. Page 9, déclaration de la Commission Massey.

Droit indirect de l'état en fonction de son devoir de veiller à la moralité publique comme l'Etat a le droit de censurer les mauvais livres et les mauvaises revues.

Au début de la radio, alors qu'il n'existait que des postes privés, nous n'avons jamais eu de

français à la radio, dans l'Ouest, malgré de nombreuses revendications. Après de nombreuses démarches signalées dans notre mémoire, nous avons eu du français à Watrous; un maximum de deux heures par jour. En 1948, on fonda la Société Radio-Gravelbourg. En 1951, on obtient notre permis. Environ 25,000 Canadiens français versent la somme de $150,000 pour l'érection du poste. Le poste était inauguré en juin 1952.

En 1949, la Commission faisait la recommandation suivante: "Que la Société Radio-Canada songe sérieusement à utiliser les postes de langue française de l'ouest canadien, comme débouchés pour les émissions d'envergure nationale en français". L'extension du réseau français aux Postes CKSB, CHFA, CFNS et CFRG, en octobre 1952, réalisait ce voeu. Notre poste devenait un jalon important et nécessaire au réseau français dans l'Ouest.

Nous nous plaisons à rendre hommage au bureau actuel des Gouverneurs de Radio-Canada, aux dirigeants de cette organisation. Tous nous ont traités, jusqu'ici, en véritables membres de la famille canadienne.

Nous avons obtenu le permis pour augmenter notre poste de 550 à 5000 watts.

Au point de vue financier, comme je l'ai dit au début, nous ne voulons retirer aucun avantage financier de l'entreprise. Notre unique intérêt dans la radio est culturel et éducationnel. Nous faisons honneur à nos obligations financières grâce à nos ventes commerciales et grâce au loyer que nous paie Radio-Canada pour ses programmes nationaux. Notre poste a besoin de ce double arrangement pour continuer son oeuvre d'éducation et de culture. Notre population de 50,000 a deux postes à soutenir en Saskatchewan,

et c'est la conclusion que nous devons en tirer: nous avons besoin de ce double arrangement pour continuer notre oeuvre.

Comme conclusion, nous vous remercions de votre bienveillante attention et exprimons l'espoir que votre enquête portera des fruits abondants pour le bien de notre vaste pays où est déjà reconnue notre biculture.

Nous exprimons les voeux suivants:

Que Radio-Canada demeure l'organisme national de la radiodiffusion et de la télévision au Canada; que les revenus nécessaires lui soient assurés pour remplir cette tâche nationale, pour réaliser tous les projets de progrès et d'amélioration que ses dirigeants envisagent pour tout le pays.

Que le réseau français devienne bientôt totalement canadien, en ce sens qu'il atteigne finalement "a mari usque ad mare" en franchissant les Rocheuses pour assurer à la population française de tout le pays, le bienfait de son action culturelle et nationale.

Que la télévision, que tous désirent, notre population française comme les autres, mais qui pose un problème concret que seul l'Etat peut solutionner, reçoive dès maintenant la solution recommandée par la Commission Massey, c'est-à-dire un aspect bilingue à tous les points de vue, sous l'habile direction de Radio-Canada, le service national de radiodiffusion et de télévision au Canada.

Ainsi nous bâtirons notre nation canadienne en autant que les deux cultures soient mises sur un pied d'égalité d'un bout à l'autre du pays.

Me deGRANDPRE: Pour résumer la partie introductive de votre mémoire, je comprends que vous

établissez le principe suivant: la radio et la télévision sont importantes au point de vue éducationnel et au point de vue culturel, et que c'est un devoir de l'Etat de voir à l'éducation et à l'éducation civique et que, par conséquent, c'est un rôle qui revient à l'Etat?

DR. ROSARIO MORIN: Oui.

Me deGRANDPRE: C'est en substance, je pense, le résumé de votre thèse?

DR. ROSARIO MORIN: Oui.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce que la conclusion à laquelle vous arrivez à l'étatisation totale du système ne va pas plus loin que les prémisses que vous posez? Est-ce que vous ne pourriez pas arriver au même résultat avec l'entreprise privée au complet sous la surveillance d'un bureau de contrôle?

DR. ROSARIO MORIN: Je ne crois pas qu'on puisse arriver au même but avec l'entreprise privée uniquement. Pour notre groupe français, c'est impossible.

Me deGRANDPRE: Je parle en terme général et même pour le groupe français. Est-ce que ce n'est pas aller plus loin que ce que les prémisses demandent que de dire que l'étatisation doit exister? Est-ce que vous ne pourriez pas, avec un organisme de contrôle pour surveiller le côté éducationnel et culturel des programmes, laisser à l'entreprise privée la radio et la télévision?

DR. ROSARIO MORIN: Non, parce que les vues de l'entreprise privée c'est le profit à réaliser.

Me deGRANDPRE: C'est l'entreprise privée laissée à elle-même?

DR. ROSARIO MORIN: Oui.

Me deGRANDPRE: Mais en la mettant un peu en tutelle, est-ce que vous n'arriveriez pas au même résultat?

DR. ROSARIO MORIN: Je ne crois pas. D'abord, il y a le point de vue financier. Au point de vue télévision le point de vue financier ne pourrait pas être réalisé, et le standard au point de vue éducationnel et culturel ne pourrait pas se garder.

Me deGRANDPRE: Vous arrivez à cela parce que, pour garder le niveau, ça ne devient plus possible d'en faire une entreprise commerciale?

DR. ROSARIO MORIN: C'est cela.

Me deGRANDPRE: Maintenant, pour arriver au problème qui vous concerne davantage, on nous a expliqué à Winnipeg la façon dont vous aviez procédé pour fonder vos postes. Est-ce que l'arrangement financier qui existe avec le poste de Saint-Boniface est identique quant à Radio-Gravelbourg? Vous avez des actionnaires qui sont élus par des délégués. C'est une situation un peu de coopérative?

DR. ROSARIO MORIN: Oui.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce que vous avez le même système de poste à Gravelbourg qu'à St-Boniface?

M. DUMONT: A peu près. Nous sommes incorporés à Ottawa, comme compagnie limitée dont les actionnaires sont élus à une réunion des délégués paroissiaux. Ces délégués paroissiaux sont élus dans les paroisses par les paroissiens et se réunissent tous les deux ans pour élire un bureau de direction. Le principe est le même.

Me deGRANDPRE: Les souscripteurs ont droit d'envoyer des délégués et les délégués ont droit de choisir des actionnaires, et les actionnaires choisissent un bureau de direction?

M. LEPAGE: Oui. Chaque Canadien français qui a souscrit un dollar a droit d'assister aux réunions paroissiales; même s'il n'a pas droit de vote il a droit d'assister aux assemblées générales.

Me deGRANDPRE: Quelle est la capitalisation du poste?

M. LEPAGE: $150,000.00.

Me deGRANDPRE: Et tout le capital a été versé?

M. LEPAGE: Même un peu plus.

Me deGRANDPRE: Maintenant, depuis que vous opérez, est-ce que vous avez opéré avec profit, juste en bouclant votre budget ou à perte?

M. LEPAGE: En considérant ce que nous recevons de Radio-Canada?

Me deGRANDPRE: Oui.

M. LEPAGE: A profit. Si nous considérons la dépréciation, nous avons opéré à déficit.

Me deGRANDPRE: Vous démontrez un profit dans vos livres quand vous ne dépréciez pas votre matériel et votre immeuble?

M. LEPAGE: Oui.

DR. ROSARIO MORIN: Les deux premières années nous avons eu des déficits considérables.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce que c'était avant que Radio-Canada vous paie quelquechose pour les programmes de soutien que vous passez sur les ondes?

DR. ROSARIO MORIN: Oui.

Me deGRANDPRE: Et ce n'est qu'avec ce que vous recevez de Radio-Canada, lorsque vous passez leurs programmes, que vous êtes en mesure de boucler votre budget?

DR. ROSARIO MORIN: Oui.

Me deGRANDPRE: Vous avez dit tout à

l'heure, monsieur LePage, que vous opériez quelque chose comme cent deux heures par semaine.

M. LEPAGE: Oui. Est-ce que je pourrais faire une rectification dans les heures d'opération? C'est 102 heures par semaine dont une moyenne de 57 heures et dix minutes sont du réseau et 44 heures 55 minutes du local.

Me deGRANDPRE: Maintenant, les programmes que vous recevez du réseau, ce sont toujours des programmes de soutien ou si vous avez des programmes commerciaux?

M. LEPAGE: Des programmes commerciaux aussi.

Me deGRANDPRE: Quelle est la proportion des programmes commerciaux que vous recevez, sur 57 heures?

M. LEPAGE: Je dirais 30 à 40 pour cent.

Me deGRANDPRE: 40 pour cent sont des programmes commerciaux et la balance des programmes de soutien?

M. LEPAGE: Oui.

Me deGRANDPRE: Et dans votre programme local, 44 heures, pourriez-vous dire quelle est la proportion de cela qui est vendue à des commanditaires?

M. LEPAGE: Environ 50 pour cent.

Me deGRANDPRE: Pourriez-vous dire également quelle est la nature en général de vos programmes locaux?

M. LEPAGE: Pour nos programmes locaux, je vous donnerai cela d'une semaine d'opération: Nous avons 30 minutes par semaine de programmes de bon vieux temps pour la population plus âgée, les pionniers du pays. Ensuite, nous avons une demi-heure par semaine de ce que nous appelons la période des

jeunes, teen-agers, ensuite, des sketches, des chansons.

M. TURCOTTE: Sous forme de disques?

M. LEPAGE: Non. Les sketches, ce sont des histoires lues par les annonceurs. Les chansons, ce sont des disques. Nous avons deux heures et demie par semaine de programmes pour les enfants.

M. TURCOTTE: Créés par qui?

M. LEPAGE: Par l'annonceur du poste. Ca comprend des chansons, chansonnettes, histoires avec participants, des jeunes qui viennent au studio, qui participent à des concours de différents genres. On les amène au studio pour les faire chanter, pour dire bonjour à leur maman. Ca les acclimate au radio. Nous avons ensuite une heure 15 par semaine dédiée aux malades, agrémentée de musique, et où nous exprimons les voeux des parents et d'amis des gens qui sont malades. Ensuite, nous avons une heure et demie par semaine d'annonces locales gratuites. Ce sont des annonces qui viennent de différentes paroisses nous demandant d'annoncer un bazar ou un pique-nique. Nous ne chargeons rien pour cela; c'est une gracieuseté du poste, une demi-heure par jour. Ensuite, nous avons une série de 30 minutes par semaine sous la rubrique: "L'enfant et ses problèmes". Ce sont des causeries qui sont données surtout en relation avec l'organisme "Foyer-Ecole" qui donne des conseils comment élever les enfants, la collaboration entre les parents et les instituteurs.

M. TURCOTTE: Créé par qui?

M. LEPAGE: C'est un Père du Collège. Ensuite, nous avons un programme religieux et un programme agricole d'une demi-heure par jour où nous donnons des conseils agricoles aux agriculteurs pour

les différentes semences propres aux différents districts.

M. TURCOTTE: Qui vous fournit cela?

M. LEPAGE: Nous tâchons de trouver cela à l'Université de Saskatchewan. C'est surtout le Fédéral et la ferme modèle de Indian Head. Nous avons aussi un programme féminin.

M. TURCOTTE: Vous avez donc pas mal de programmes vivants?

M. LEPAGE: Considérant le personnel, oui. Je vais vous avouer que des fois ça force; ça devient lourd. Nous avons deux jeunes filles: une est discothécaire et fait l'horaire; l'autre fait la comptabilité et est réceptionniste et fait le trafif. Ces deux jeunes filles font tout ce travail par dévouement. Pour le sport, nous avons un bulletin de cinq minutes par jour. Les nouvelles: nous avons cinq bulletins de nouvelles de cinq minutes par jour, six jours par semaine. C'est de la nouvelle locale autant que possible. Ensuite, nous avons deux heures par semaine de nouvelles régionales et nationales que nous recevons de British United Press. Ensuite, nous avons un programme "Un artiste" 30 minutes par semaine, qui est de la musique expliquée. C'est fait par un membre du personnel. Le restant, c'est du commercial.

Cet hiver, nous avons eu une série de programmes de trente minutes par semaine qui étaient montés par les élèves de philosophie du Collège. Ce sont eux qui faisaient le programme. C'a duré les mois de classe: de la fin de novembre au début de mai. Nous avons de la chanson canadienne, des chansonnettes, musique de danse et causeries.

Me deGRANDPRE: Maintenant, pour attaquer le problème financier - il y a un problème

double: il y a votre problème et le problème financier dans l'ordre national. Dans l'ordre national, est-ce que votre association a des vues particulières sur la façon de financer Radio-Canada? Pensez-vous que ça devrait être fait par voie de subsides, par voie de licences?

M. LEPAGE: Exprimant une opinion personnelle et aussi partiellement une opinion de l'exécutif, c'est qu'on ne voit riende mal dans le financement par frais de permis pour chaque appareil. Je vais être juste. Est-ce que ce n'est pas celui qui bénéficie du service qui doit payer pour cela plutôt que de charger en général? Maintenant, c'est l'application de ce système-là à laquelle on semble s'attaquer. On semble croire que ce n'est pas un système pratique au point de vue de perception des licences.

Me deGRANDPRE: Etant donné que c'est une opinion personnelle, est-ce que vous avez d'autres vues?

DR. ROSARIO MORIN: Ici, nous disons à nos dirigeants de choisir les moyens. Nous savons que c'est nécessaire. Nous leur disons: "C'est à vous, vous êtes compétents". Je crois que les gens ne sont pas contre l'idée que cette finance soit prise des taxes. Ils s'y attendent.

Me deGRANDPRE: Vous n'avez jamais discuté, comme groupe, cet aspect particulier de la question?

DR. ROSARIO MORIN: Non.

Me deGRANDPRE: Maintenant, quant au problème financier immédiat qui intéresse les postes de la Saskatchewan et tous les postes de l'Ouest, est-ce que vous préférez continuer selon la formule établie par Radio-Canada jusqu'à date, ou préféreriez-

vous être englobés par Radio-Canada dans tout le réseau français, à la condition, évidemment, que ce que vous avez gagné vous soit conservé, que les postes que vous avez ne fassent partie que du réseau français?

M. LEPAGE: Nous sommes allés plus loin que ça. Nous avons offert nos postes à Radio-Canada pour rien. On leur a dit: "On les a bâtis, prenez-les".

M. TURCOTTE: Vous les avez offerts gratuitement?

M. LEPAGE: Oui.

M. TURCOTTE: Est-ce qu'il y a longtemps?

M. LEPAGE: Deux ans et demi ou trois ans.

M. TURCOTTE: QU'est-ce qu'ils ont dit?

M. LEPAGE: Non. On a fait le calcul avec les membres de Radio-Canada, et Radio-Canada a l'expérience d'un poste d'Etat ailleurs. Ils ont figuré que nos postes coûteraient à Radio-Canada, à cause des différents aspects, parce que c'est un poste d'Etat, coûteraient à Radio-Canada le double de ce qu'ils nous coûtent actuellement comme exploitation, parce que l'auditoire que nous avons sont des gens qui ont contribué aux postes et qu'ils savent que nous faisons notre possible, ils sont moins exigeants que si Radio-Canada avait les postes en main.

Me deGRANDPRE: Lorsque vous avez fait votre proposition à Radio-Canada, ils n'ont rien fait?

M. LEPAGE: Non.

M. TURCOTTE: Vous proposez d'étendre le service français à la Côte du Pacifique. Pensez-vous qu'il soit possible d'ériger un poste là-bas? Comment le voyez-vous? Est-ce qu'il y aurait moyen

de faire ce que vous avez fait, ou faudrait-il que Radio-Canada fasse là-bas ce qu'ils n'ont pas fait ici pour vous?

M. LEPAGE: Je crois que dans les environs de Vancouver et dans les banlieues il y a environ 40,000 Canadiens-français. Maintenant, ce qui leur a manqué, ce n'est pas de leur faute. Une grande partie de ces gens-là sont nos enfants de Saskatchewan qui sont allés dans l'Ouest, et ce qui leur a manqué jusqu'à date c'est une organisation qui ferait les sacrifices nécessaires. Maintenant, est-ce qu'on doit leur demander cela? Personnellement, je concevrais -- c'est peut-être inconcevable -- je verrais l'extension du réseau de Edmonton à Vancouver: un poste qui diffuserait des programmes du réseau. Au moins, ils auraient quelque chose.

M. TURCOTTE: Qui serait propriétaire?

M. LEPAGE: Ca serait de l'organisation locale. C'est un poste qui pourrait se maintenir assez économiquement.

Me deGRANDPRE: Ce serait uniquement un transmetteur de l'est à l'ouest?

M. LEPAGE: Oui. Il faudrait qu'il soit relié à Edmonton; et quand il ne serait pas relié au réseau il faudrait qu'il accepte ce qu'il y a à Edmonton.

DR. ROSARIO MORIN: Il y a une organisation canadienne-française à Vancouver que je connais. Le président est le Dr. Beaudoin, et je sais qu'il y a une organisation active. Au point de vue financier, je crois que les Canadiens-français de la Colombie sont des ouvriers avec des obligations familiales, et avec le coût élevé de la vie ... Au point de vue financier, je doute qu'on puisse leur demander les

sacrifices qu'on a demandés aux Canadiens-français de la Saskatchewan. Les Canadiens-français, là-bas, sont surtout des ouvriers.

M. TURCOTTE: Il faudrait donc, d'après vous, que ce soit une initiative de Radio-Canada?

DR. ROSARIO MORIN: Oui, afin de rejoindre ces gens et leur faire bénéficier de nos programmes éducationnels et culturels.

(Page 1487 follows)

THE CHAIRMAN: Just in concluding this part of the hearings, I think this is the last of the briefs in French that we will have to do and I want to thank those who brought these briefs to us and explained them to us in French. I think this in itself shows some progress. I was on a somewhat similar venture to this about 19 years ago, a Royal Commission, and I do not think there were any briefs presented in French in the West, but this time we have had five or six in Winnipeg and two here, and we are to receive some in Edmonton and in Saskatoon. I think some progress is being made. We thank you very much for these briefs and we will consider them.

SUBMISSION OF SASKATCHEWAN PROVINCIAL COMMITTEE, LABOUR PROGRESSIVE PARTY.

APPEARANCES:

MRS. NELSON CLARKE.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief we are to hear is from the Saskatchewan Committee of the Labour Progressive Party and Mrs. Nelson Clarke is to present that brief. Mrs. Clarke, I understand you are a member of the Provincial Executive of the Labour Progressive Party and that your husband who is with you is the Provincial Leader of the Labour Progressive Party.

MRS. CLARKE: Yes, that is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will mark your brief as Exhibit 64.

EXHIBIT NO. 64: Brief filed by Saskatchewan Provincial Committee of the Labour Progressive Party.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you present your brief as you wish to do?

MRS. CLARKE: Mr. Chairman, I think first of all, the Labour Progressive Party in Saskatchewan welcomes the opportunity both for us and all sections of the community here to express our opinion on a matter which is of great concern. Since the last Royal Commission that was here on radio and television there has been a development in this province of two television stations and I think too the question of television and radio broadcasting is receiving a tremendous amount of attention today. It is estimated that for Regina there are now 25,000 receivers circulation for television and for Saskatoon 20,000. I think it is increasing from day to day if the reports on the sales of TV sets are any indication and it is certainly true that television in Saskatoon is becoming an increasingly important medium of education and entertainment.

In our brief we state as a main point that radio and television programmes in our country should seek to fully develop our own Canadian culture, inspiring Canadians with pride in the traditions of our country; the labour of its people in the building of a new land; the sturdy traditions of independence and democracy which have been such a marked feature of our history, coupled with the development of an understanding of the great future which can be ours in a country so richly endowed with a highly-skilled people and vast natural resources.

At the same time radio and TV programmes should help to cultivate understanding and friendship between the peoples of our country and of all other countries.

We support everything that promotes genuine friendship between ourselves and the people of the United States, but in common with many other Canadians we take exception to the excessively high proportion of the United States programmes carried on Canadian Radio and TV; many of which are not of good quality and some of which glorify violence and racism.

I think in the last few months magazine and newspaper surveys that have taken place indicate that basically what the Canadian people want is Canadian TV and Canadian radio. I think that the role that is played by the CBC in its programmes is an indication of the type of programme that is wanted by Canadian people.

I was looking through a back issue of the CBC Times and noted listed such programmes as "Signs of the times, signs of the past" from Winnipeg, I did not see the programme but I understand it was on the early history of Winnipeg; the Round Table discussion with the Canadian Labour Congress leaders who had just been elected; folk songs and so on, programmes which are of interest and necessary for the development of Canadian TV and radio.

I think if we go back to the Royal Commission of 1929, the Aird Commission, that the principle which was stated in their report still applies today. Their report said:

> "There has been unanimity on one fundamental question - Canadian

radio listeners want Canadian broadcasting. At present the majority of programmes heard are from sources outside of Canada. In a country of the vast geographical dimensions of Canada, broadcasting will become a great force in fostering a national spirit and interpreting national citizenship."

I do not think that in 1956 which is 27 years later, there is need for changing that principle in relation to broadcasting and television.

Our opinion on the financing of television particularly and radio at this time is that it should continue to be publicly financed. We feel that the 15 percent tax on radio and television sets should be maintained, that there should be some examination of whether the fees that are paid by private stations to CBC are high enough. The figures, which unfortunately I do not have with me, I think indicate that they are perhaps a bit low in relation to the service that the private stations get from the CBC.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are speaking of the licence fee?

MRS. CLARKE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: That I think technically does not go to the CBC, does not that go to the Department of Transport?

MR. CLARKE: I think probably it does.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, so there is no misunderstanding on the subject of fees to the CBC.

MR. COYNE: It is turned over to the CBC.

MRS. CLARKE: Yes, from the Department.

We also feel there should be a statutory grant from Parliament to enable the CBC to continue with the work that it is doing today and to extend their work. I think the question, for instance, the question of colour television will require money and we feel there should be grants from Parliament. Perhaps at a figure around $20,000,000 a year to the CBC to maintain and extend its work. We do not feel that increased advertising on television should be used in order to increase the financial resources.

Just as I was leaving to come down here, a young person here in Regina who is quite a TV viewer said to me, "Well, whatever you say, just tell them there should be no more advertising, there is too much as it is on the television stations", and I think that is a feeling a great many people have about the commercialism of television, that it has gone even beyond the bounds of commercialism on radio and we feel that the regulations should be strengthened in relation to the amount of time per hour or per programme that is devoted to commercials. Perhaps a commercial at the beginning of a programme and maybe even at the end, but these three, four and five times in an hour programme of commercials is an excessive amount.

We also feel that there is the need in Western Canada for further development of CBC television stations. At this point, as you are aware, there is no CBC television station between Winnipeg and Vancouver and, of course, neither of these stations in any way serves Saskatchewan and we feel that there should be ---

THE CHAIRMAN: You are talking now of --- ?

MRS. CLARKE: Of viewing it.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are talking strictly of CBC owned and operated stations?

MRS. CLARKE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you know the suggestion is put forward that a good deal of supporting evidence shows that the private television stations are operating as agencies of the national service and they do in fact carry a considerable portion of the national programme.

MRS. CLARKE: I think that is true, but I think unless we have in the Province of Saskatchewan a CBC station owned and operated by the CBC that there will not be the fullest development in this province of the Canadian programming and Canadian programmes that is needed.

I know that the private stations in the province do carry some CBC material, but I think that it does not solve the problem that we feel exists in the need to have in this Province a situation such as the CBC would provide where Canadian programming would be its main emphasis. I do not feel that the private stations in this province do that job. I think that what was said by the Minister of Transport back in 1953 in a debate in the House of Commons is quite true. This was said by Mr. Lionel Chevrier, the Minister of Transport in March, 1953, and he said:

> "People who invest their money in private television stations, like people who invest their money in other business enterprises, are investing that money to make money - they will certainly invest their money where they

"will make a profit by importing American programmes - if on the other hand they will make very little or no profit by originating Canadian programmes."

I do not think we can blame the people in Canadian television stations for doing that, it would be absurd for them to do anything else, but we in Saskatchewan who would be paying our share towards the public broadcasts and public TV in Canada as a whole should also have the advantages of a station that is not in business to make money but is part of a national network of CBC stations.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just pausing a moment there, if the station in Regina is carrying the full national programme of the CBC system, it cannot make any difference to the viewer whether the signal is emitted from a privately-owned or publicly-owned station.

MRS. CLARKE: Well, I do not think they carry the full CBC programme.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very near it.

MRS. CLARKE: I think there is also the need for developing in this province more - there is the other side of it, what emanates from the Toronto or Montreal or Vancouver stations is one thing but there is also the possibility of developing in this province Canadian programmes originating here, and that is not solved either through a private station that will be receiving material from the CBC or even through a micro-wave system which will certainly improve transmission in all sorts of cases, but it won't enable the origination of programmes here. It seems to me this is a crucial question,

that it is not solved by anything except an increase in public broadcasting and particularly by a CBC station in the province. I think that the experience that we have had in Canada with radio broadcasting and the role that is played by the CBC in that regard and the development of talent and Canadian culture is a further argument that we should have an extension of the same development in relation to television. I think the argument that private stations will do the job that the CBC does is quite erroneous because I have not seen either in radio or on television any evidence of that. I think the tendency is to get package programmes and I think the cost and everything else that is involved, there is not that development of the talent of the people and we, in Saskatchewan, who have people of just about every nationality that come to Canada make up the fabric of our Canadian life and we can produce some very wonderful television and radio programmes if there was such development here. We have the French-Canadians who were just before us on the Commission, the Ukranians, the Russians, Germans and every conceivable nationality here in this province who could certainly give a great deal in terms of education and entertainment through TV. I think the fact that CBK Watrous, the CBC radio station, from my experience in this province and, I think, others in this organization had the same thought, it is the most listened to radio station in the province; that could perhaps be that it is the only one that can be heard everywhere in the province, but I do not think people listen for that reason alone, I think there is a very different regard to what the CBC puts on as to the private radio stations. I think if there was a

CBC television station here that many sets would not move from that channel. I personally know many people who say they will not buy a television set unless we get in Saskatchewan a CBC station.

THE CHAIRMAN: We were told in Winnipeg that until there was a private station there, they would not buy the sets.

MRS. CLARKE: Well, that is Winnipeg.

THE CHAIRMAN: Maybe they just did not want to buy sets.

MRS. CLARKE: I think the question of whether it is financially possible to increase the stations in Canada beyond what the CBC has already done, it seems to me the formula that was put forward by the Minister of Finance during the War that what is physically possible is financially possible, is quite true in connection with radio and television, as well as in other things, and toget involved in argument about where the money is coming from, somehow it seems to me it takes away from the need of the development in this country of an increase in the cultural presentations through radio and television.

THE CHAIRMAN: Unfortunately, we have to give some consideration to it according to our terms of reference.

MRS. CLARKE: I think there is one other feature in terms of the programming through television as well as radio, and that is the question of local community programmes of the type of Round Table, I think there is need of that to be developed.

There is, for instance, in Regina, as we have mentioned in our brief, the Regina Peoples Forum which has been in existence for almost forty years now,

and has met continuously on Sunday afternoons. The televising of a portion of this forum, either in part or in a whole would certainly add to the development of local discussion around the questions that are to be on TV.

I think, it is not in our brief, but we feel there is a particular question in relation to children's programmes and the need of developing a greater amount of programmes that, first of all, have not some of the aspects of violence and racism that some of the American programmes have and that also deal with Canadian things. For instance, the Regina Leader Post had an editorial headed "Why did Canada Steal Crockett?" John Fisher in Regina suggested that perhaps some of the Canadians who shot bear on the Western Plains one hundred years before Davie Crockett could be put on the Canadian programmes, and I think it is a good thing to bring to the children of this country the history and the background that they have. I think the children today know more about what happened in the United States in the earlier years than some of their own history and I think the role of American radio and television programmes in that plays a very large part.

We feel that Canadian production in films and radio and TV has been recognized on a world scale as being of exceptional quality and I think to look at the record our National Film Board and CBC radio programme is something of which we can be very proud.

About three years ago the General Manager of the CBC said this:

> "Television should not only be entertaining and informative, but should also be suited to the inter-

> ests of the Canadian audiences and to the national interests of Canada. Thus Canadian programmes should be such as to encourage and develop Canadian talent and create opportunities for Canadian self-expression generally so as to avoid the complete absorption of Canada into the general cultural pattern of the United States."

It seems to me we have that danger as well unless there is a combination of public broadcasting and the greatest guarantee to the Canadian people it seems to us in order to develop that is the maintaining and control by the people of Canada through Parliament of the CBC on broadcasting and television production.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Mr. deGrandpre?

MR. DeGRANDPRE: One of the main arguments that you have put forward is that the CBC has done very much to bring about Canadian culture and Canadianism and to help talent. Let us stop there and I would ask you if that is a fair statement or is it unfair to the private stations? For instance, we have been here for four hours now and we have heard a lot of praise for the private stations, the school broadcast branch of the Department of Education first of all imported an education programme which was carried on the Columbia Broadcasting System, the American School of the Air and this was something produced by private stations in the States and it was imported later here in Canada. Then, they realized they wanted to have some Canadian on the air and they used CBC outlets and private station outlets, so is this broad

statement that you have made entirely fair?

MRS. CLARKE: Well, it would seem to me it would be wrong to say every programme produced in the United States is no good, I think we have many programmes from the United States that are good, but I think it would help, I think it would be wrong to get everything from the United States or to say everything could be done by the CBC. I think from my listening to the radio that while there is some material carried on private stations, and I would not want to say there is not carried on private stations, but by and large the development of Canadian programming has been through the CBC and it seems to me that the impetus given to the private stations is because of the role of the CBC and it in a sense put some pressure on the private stations to do this rather than what I think could very easily develop without the CBC here, and that is the complete use of programmes that are not developed in Canada.

MR. DeGRANDPRE: Well, again speaking here, we have been told this morning by a private radio station that they were carrying live Canadian programmes which were rather successful, and then as soon as the talent is big enough to go on the network it had to go to the CBC and is it not due to the presence of CBC that you can never compare CBC with anything else?

MRS. CLARKE: I do not think so.

MR. DeGRANDPRE: Because we have been given facts, two briefs particularly about this particular aspect of the question.

MRS. CLARKE: Well, in that brief, I think if there has been developed a talent over CHAB Moosejaw, that talent should be heard nationally, I do not see

anything terribly wrong with it going to the CBC.

MR. DeGRANDPRE: I do not suggest it is wrong for the talent to go to the CBC but I am suggesting it is probably unfair to compare the CBC activities with the activities of the private stations, that is what I am trying to discuss with you.

MRS. CLARKE: Well, it would seem to me that it would not - I do not see exactly what this question would mean except that private stations, I do not think by and large, have been the developers of Canadian talent, but that does not mean that no private station at no time has developed Canadian talent. That would be an extreme we would not go to. However, I think the main impetus in the development of Canadian talent is the CBC.

Now, whether private stations with the expenditures of the CBC, which is the only hypothesis on which you can work, would amount to continuing the development of Canadian talent, I personally doubt it. Now, I could be wrong, but I think the experience of radio to me bears out that it has been the CBC that has been the developer of Canadian talent, Canadian programmes.

MR. DeGRANDPRE: We have all heard while we were in Ottawa that some of the CBC programmes that are carried on the transcontinental network today were given by private stations for the first two or three weeks and then taken over by the network because it was a good programme. Were you aware of that?

MRS. CLARKE: Well, I have not read all the briefs that were presented to the Commission.

MR. DeGRANDPRE: Now, you are referring to private stations, and you say:

"Immediate steps should be taken towards the establishment of CBC television stations in both Regina and Saskatoon---"

And your argument for making this request, if I remember correctly, was you are paying your share of the CBC service here and you should have CBC stations carrying these programmes. However, carrying this argument further, is it also fair to give you dual service in these areas which would prevent the establishment of the service in areas that are not covered at all?

MRS. CLARKE: Well, first of all, our argument was not because we were putting money in we should get service back, I think we pointed out earlier that mainly it is not to get services back in the monetary sense but getting back to the development of programming in Saskatchewan to a Canadian character and using Canadian or Saskatchewan talent. I think there is need of both of developing television naturally in these places that have not got it yet, I would not say it should be put in Saskatchewan before some other places have television.

THE CHAIRMAN: You say:

"Immediate steps should be taken towards the establishment of CBC television stations..."

You use the words "immediate steps"?

MRS. CLARKE: It seems to me one of the immediate steps that could be taken is in the review of the programming that the CBC would be putting forward, that the question of the dual stations in this province be put on the agenda, so to speak, that would be an immediate step.

At this point, to my knowledge, there is not a proposal of a CBC station being established here, and that that be included in the programme. Now, the speed at which that is built and put into operation is a relative question.

MR. DeGRANPRE: The words "immediate steps"?

MRS. CLARKE: I am not suggesting anyone should go out and start building.

MR. DeGRANDPRE: It should be qualified by the additional words "when a greater coverage is given throuout the country"?

MRS. CLARKE: Yes.

MR. DeGRANDPRE: Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mrs. Clark. We will have a seven or eight minute break now.

---A short recess.

SUBMISSION BY A GROUP OF REGINA HOUSEWIVES.

APPEARANCES:

PHYLLIS LEVIN

JULIET SHAPIRO

JUNE MITCHELL

THE CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Levin, you have a very short submission to make on behalf of a group of housewives in Regina; would you care to come up and present this now?

MRS. LEVIN: May I bring my colleagues?

THE CHAIRMAN: You may, indeed. Mrs. Levin, in view of the fact we had not known your group was

going to have a brief for us and going to be presenting it today, we hadn't really made time for this, and we will have to ask you to present it to us fairly quickly if you will, in order to get through and be able to catch our train.

MRS. LEVIN: Thank you very much for the opportunity.

EXHIBIT NO: 65: Brief of a group of Regina Housewives.

MRS. SHAPIRO: As a random group of Regina housewives, we are most concerned with the future of broadcasting and telecasting in Canada. The CBC has accepted the inescapable fact that radio and television have become major teachers of moral, intellectual and ethical values. We believe that the CBC has promoted these values, and has developed artistic experience generally, to the highest level of which our society is capable at the present time. We must assume that a private radio or TV station exists with the main purpose of obtaining revenue for its services.

We in Regina are especially anxious to see the role of the CBC strengthened because it offers the main relief from the dangerous practise of the single ownership of the three basic media of communication today -- newspaper, radio and TV. This type of control, in our view, should be prohibited.

CBC programming is of special significance to the housewife because it presents something of a challenging nature. It gives us good music, fair and objective political and international comment, drama, help with consumer and household problems, and discussions by well-informed observers. On the other hand, private radio has been content to take the unimaginative path of least resistance in almost every

instance. Regina's private stations -- with the possible exception of some Dominion Network programmes - offer mainly giveaway programmes, disc jockey shows, sportcasts, imported canned comedy and variety shows, innumerable crime stories, and unbearable quantities of advertising.

Our children love adventure and action. Private stations offer these almost entirely in the form of Hollywood-type cowboys with their lynch laws, war and spy stories, hardly designed to engender any sense of social responsibility. The CBC, on the other hand, supplied dramatized classics such as THE LAST OF THE MOHICANS, HEIDI, and other realistic tales of cowboys, sailors, prospectors, explorers, sportsmen and pioneers.

Humour for children on private stations is 90% little animals mangling bigger ones, and the other 10% consists of stammering, puns, and custard-pie throwing. On the CBC children get their humour through folk songs, poetry, and stories for children such as JUBILEE ROAD, MAGGIE MUGGINS, and JAKE AND THE KID. Programmes such as KINDERGARTEN OF THE AIR, the school broadcasts, CAMP WILDERNESS, the SOUNDS FUN CLUB, CBC STAMP CLUB, and FOLK SONG TIME are all CBC bonuses for which there is no counterpart on Regina's private stations. Our children's lives would be poorer indeed without CBC excellence.

The CBC has given Canadian talent an opportunity to develop in many fields which would not have been possible through private radio and TV. Canadian writers, commentators and musicians have not only found employment, but they have also contributed much toward the establishment of a Canadian culture.

The CBC provides a link between all of the people of Canada. In a country which is so sparsely populated, it would be impossible for private finance to provide adequate radio and TV service to scattered communities.

CBC-TV offers the same potential of development as CBC Radio whose achievement is acknowledged. TV is expensive and the development of original Canadian material is also expensive. The resources of a large Canada-wide agency can attempt Canadian TV programmes of quality. There is no reason to assume that the development of private TV will do better than parallel the development of private radio in Canada, whose limitations are acknowledged.

Private broadcasters have been calling for the establishment of an independent board to regulate radio and TV. We feel, however, that no change from the present system should be considered unless it is shown clearly as superior to the present system in independence and impartiality. The CBC has been extremely effective in radio -- if it has any fault, it lies in the fact that it has not taken as firm a hand as it should in controlling advertising and general programming on private stations.

If private radio is so certain that it can equal the programming of the CBC, why have they not already do so? They have had sufficient radio and TV time to experiment. On the basis of their record, it would be folly indeed to allow their super-commercialism to dominate Canadian radio and television. Rather the CBC should be strengthened and supported for the fine job if has done in serving the needs of a developing Canada.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mrs. Shapiro. Are there any other comments to be added from your associates?

MRS. LEVIN: We would like to reserve the opportunity to add, if that is possible.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we are not going to be back in Regina, I am afraid, but we will be very glad to receive additional written submissions if you wish to send them in.

I would like to ask you a word about this housewive's committee: Is this, so to speak, an ad hoc committee for the purpose of preparing the brief for the Commission, or have you been in existence for some time?

MRS. LEVIN: We formed for the purpose of making the submission.

THE CHAIRMAN: How many members are there on the committee -- the ones listed on the bottom of the second page?

MRS. LEVIN: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Mrs. Shapiro, I have one question concerning these programmes that you list at the bottom of page 1 as illustrative of good programmes: I understand that in Saskatchewan there are ten radio stations of which only one is C.B.C.-owned and operated. Are these programmes carried exclusively by CBK-Watrous, or do they reach the people of Saskatchewan through the private stations?

MRS. SHAPIRO: I believe they are

exclusive with the C.B.C., but I may have to be corrected on that if I am wrong.

THE CHAIRMAN: It may be part of the Dominion network or the Trans-Canada network with which the private stations are affiliates.

MR. COYNE: That is my question.

MRS. SHAPIRO: They are exclusive on the C.B.C. unless they are on the northern stations that we cannot get, like Saskatoon and North Battleford. They are not carried on Moose Jaw or Regina stations.

MR. COYNE: In the T.V. field I understand there are two television stations in Saskatchewan and they are both privately-owned?

MRS. SHAPIRO: That is right.

MR. COYNE: So that you are receiving the C.B.C. service, television service, in Saskatchewan through privately-owned stations?

MRS. SHAPIRO: We are receiving it, yes, but I understand that private stations are only required to carry, I believe, 80% of the material that is carried through C.B.C.

MR. COYNE: 8%?

MRS. SHAPIRO: 80%.

MR. COYNE: 80%.

MRS. SHAPIRO: And unfortunately we don't always get the highest quality as a result of this, because we have been getting some very good things such as Exploring Minds and things that were really stimulating, and this year they have been dropped because they have local sponsors for other things

which we might consider inferior.

MR. COYNE: Just one other question: Actually, it is a question you raise at the bottom of page 2: "If private radio is so certain that it can equal the programming of the C.B.C., why have they not already done so?" My only suggestion is that perhaps you have answered your own question a couple of paragraphs further up when you refer to T.V. being expensive and the development of original Canadian material is also expensive.

MRS. SHAPIRO: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Do you think it is reasonable to expect private stations, dependent purely upon their own resources, to arrive at the same level of programming at the C.B.C. whose programming is subsidized and financed by public funds?

MRS. SHAPIRO: No, of course we don't even expect that, and that is why we are hoping that the C.B.C. gathers more funds for their work and they continue to expand throughout the country and give us the excellent service they have been doing.

MR. COYNE: With the use of public funds?

MRS. SHAPIRO: Yes, as a public service.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: I have only one point, and it is not a question but merely an observation I would like to make. On the second page of your submission you say, "There is no reason to assume that the development of private T.V. will do better than parallel the development of private radio in Canada, whose limitations are acknowledged."

I think in fairness to the private operators we should say that they have informed us that because of the limitations on their ability to have an over-all network throughout Canada, their ability to attract and give comparable shows with the C.B.C. has been curtailed by reason of their inability to form networks. I think we must mention that in fairness to those private stations because I think they feel that could they go through with a large network, they might come up to the excellence of the C.B.C. -- in fact, I have probably said that wrongly, because I think probably they are as good as the C.B.C. now. However, they do admit their limitations because of the inability to carry through on a large network.

MRS. LEVIN: May I say that I don't think quality is always governed by the amount of money spent, but I think it is governed by aims and values.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we are very glad to have this group of private citizens who have been interested enough to do some work on the subject and prepare a brief and come and present it, and we appreciate that. Thank you very much.

MRS. LEVIN: Thank you very much.

SUBMISSION OF THE SASKATCHEWAN WHEAT POOL.

APPEARANCE:

Mr. B.W. Robertson.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Robertson, you are presenting the brief on behalf of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool?

MR. ROBERTSON: Yes.

EXHIBIT NO. 66: Brief of The Saskatchewan Wheat Pool.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you present it as seems best to you.

MR. ROBERTSON: With your permission I would like to quote fairly freely from the brief we have prepared.

Our Organization subscribes to the opinion expressed by the Royal Commission on Arts, Letters and Sciences, in paragraph 78 on page 300 of its report, where it says that in Canada radio has a particularly important task. It must offer information, education and entertainment to a diverse and scattered population. It must also develop a sense of national unity between our two main races, and among our various ethnic groups, in spite of a strongly developed regional sense and of the attractions of our engaging and influential southern neighbour.

It is the view of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool that this statement of purposes applies with equal force to television broadcasting because of

the potentially greater influence which this new medium may exert upon those whom it serves.

If radio and television broadcasting are to do the jobs set out in the paragraph quoted above, it seems to this Organization that the system under which they operate should have four main characteristics, namely:

First, that its services should be available to the largest possible number of Canadians.

Second, that programming should be free from partisan political control.

Third, that some control is required over programming generally.

Fourth, that it should be national in scope.

The achievement of these four criteria in broadcasting within Canada is most likely to be achieved, the Wheat Pool believes, under a public corporation established with very much the same kind and degree of control which the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation now exercises. This Organization does not believe that the responsibility for the effectiveness of radio and television in promoting the national interest can or ought to be separated from the function of control over the operations of the two media. We are of the opinion that the single national system which now exists should be preserved if radio and television are to serve effectively the interest of all Canadians.

May we illustrate this by looking briefly at the characteristics which were set up a moment

ago?

Its services should be available to the largest possible number of Canadians: Rural Saskatchewan is one of the most sparsely populated parts of the settled area of Canada. Today, the Province is well-served by private and public radio stations alike. But in the early days of radio it was much easier for many Saskatchewan residents to hear broadcasts from stations established in the United States than it was to get Canadian stations. It was, surely, in the interest of national unity, to offer rural Saskatchewan an opportunity to hear the best Canadian programmes through a national system of broadcasting. And this, it appears, was one of the motives which prompted the Aird Commission to recommend a national system of broadcasting for Canada.

Now, as television is becoming a practical means of communication large numbers of people in rural Saskatchewan appear unlikely to have any television service made available to them until a national system is evolved which consciously seeks to expand television service to the largest possible audience in Canada.

Indeed, in the light of the conditions as they exist in Saskatchewan, one might make a reasonably fair case for suggesting that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation should undertake to develop television facilities in Saskatchewan and other sparsely populated rural areas ahead of alternative service to metropolitan communities which may already

have more than one source of television. They do not press this case, and we are not advocating this at the moment; nevertheless, this Organization does feel that the present unified national control over broadcasting should be maintained through the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation with the objective of bringing television service to the largest possible number of farm families throughout Canada.

That programming should be free from partisan political control: There is no need to argue this principle before this Commission. However, the question is raised at this time to differentiate between control by a public corporation and control by a department of Government. This Organization believes it is preferable to have responsibility for radio and television service lodged with a public corporation responsible to Parliament rather than to the Cabinet. We will refer to this later in this submission.

That some control is required over programming generally: It is the view of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool that some public control should be maintained over general programming in the national interest. This view is based on two main considerations.

In the first place, some control should be exerted over broadcasting to maintain the widest possible degree of access to radio and television. It is not likely, but it is possible, that in a situation entirely free from public control radio

and television could fall into the hands of a relatively few persons who could, if they chose, deny all contrary opinion access to the facilities.

It is just as well to remember few individuals or groups can afford the luxury of ownership and control of these means of communication even where it is physically possible to have a number of outlets. The cost of television service, particularly, restricts ownership and control of this medium. These factors narrowly limit the number of individuals or groups who may enjoy ownership and control of broadcasting facilities. A degree of public control, therefore, is generally accepted, I think, as necessary in the national interest. I would like to emphasize that point, Mr. Chairman: Radio is unlike other means of communication, such as printing and so forth. Still today a man can set up a little printing shop in his basement and turn out pamphlets. You can't do that sort of thing with radio and television.

The listener, too, has a fundamental interest in a balanced broadcasting programme. Radio and television differ from other means of communication such as books, magazines or newspapers in this way; radio and television programmes cannot be stored up to be enjoyed at the convenience of the individual. You either hear it or you don't; it is there and it is gone. As a result, there are only a relatively few hours in each day when a majority of individuals may see or listen to television and radio programmes. In a sparsely settled area such as

Saskatchewan where the number of radio and television outlets is likely to be limited for many years, the importance of having an over-all radio and television service which can cater to a wide variety of listener-interest becomes a matter of considerable importance.

The Saskatchewan Wheat Pool suggests that the combination of these factors makes it important for Canada to support a single national system of radio and television which has the authority and the will to allot time to various groups of listeners on a reasonably fair basis. A purely commercial system which is subject to steady economic pressure may not be able to satisfy all listeners and viewers to the same extent as a system which is directly concerned with the provision of a variety of radio and television programmes to interest many different groups in the population.

For example, programmes which may have a special interest to farm listeners, say, Farm Radio Forum, may not always be the type of programme which readily attract commercial sponsorship. Yet it is important that these programmes should be available. It is, therefore, important to have a national system of broadcasting which will make these programmes available and which has the authority to see that they are broadcast at times and over such stations as are convenient to the audience to which they are directed.

The necessity for coordinating the means

of producing such programmes and the control necessary to see that they are effectively made available to an audience is one of the chief reasons why we believe it is necessary to maintain a single national service in radio and television. Further, an effective national radio and television service should have both the authority to regulate radio and television broadcasting and also the means to prepare and disseminate programmes of its own.

That is should be national in scope: It is the belief of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool that the national system of radio as developed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has been an important element in the development of a national spirit among Canadians. Television offers many opportunities to further this development. It is, therefore, just as important now as in the time of the Aird Commission to maintain a national system of radio broadcasting and to expand it to television.

A national system implies that the group which is charged with the responsibility of promoting the nation's interest should have control of adequate facilities for reaching the maximum number of Canadians. It is necessary at present, in radio, to use a combination of publicly-owned and privately-owned radio stations to bring a choice of programmes to a national audience. If the Broadcasting Corporation is to continue to serve the maximum number of Canadians, then it must either continue to have the authority to use private stations

or it must construct new facilities of its own.

The Wheat Pool is of the opinion that it is more economical and more efficient to maintain the present system than to extend C.B.C. facilities into every community. This matter of efficiency and cost will carry even much more weight in the development of the more expensive medium of television.

We do not believe an adequate national system of broadcasting can be maintained either efficiently or economically by divorcing private stations from C.B.C. control and setting up a competitive system under the control of a newly created organization which will, in the very nature of things, be obliged to treat both the C.B.C. and the private system identically. This is not the way either to good radio and television service or to economy.

The terms of reference of your inquiry invite comment on the financing of radio and television service in Canada. We have very few remarks to offer in this regard.

Because the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool believes the radio and television authority should be independent of parties and political influence and should not be entirely dependent on commercial revenue, the matter in which funds for radio and television service are provided becomes definitely important. The achievement of financial independence for the broadcasting service while maintaining the necessary democratic control over the expenditure of money presents very obvious difficulties.

The ability of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to earn some of its financial needs from commercial sources provides, of course, a partial solution. The Saskatchewan Wheat Pool would be most reluctant to see the radio service obliged to earn all of its revenue from commercial sources or, even, to depend on such sources for a major portion of its funds. A situation of that sort might possibly lead to an excess of commercial programming to the exclusion of some types of programme which have a particular interest to farm audiences.

It follows, therefore, that this Organization supports the principle that the largest part of the revenue to provide radio service in Canada should be provided by the public. This can be done by one of several ways or by a combination of more than one. Some of the ways which come to mind are, and which have been discussed often before your Commission:

Parliamentary grants;

License fees paid by the public on radio and television sets;

Ear-marked taxes.

We understand the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is presently financed by a combination of Parliamentary grants and ear-marked taxes, the latter being levied upon the purchase of radio and television sets and parts. The last tax seems eminently fair, inasmuch as it is paid by persons who benefit from the service. Unfortunately, it is not large enough to maintain the service so that

other means are necessary.

Too heavy a reliance on grants for radio service unfortunately exposes the radio and television authority to the possibility of partisan political influence under the Canadian system of public finance. Since all public expenditures must originate with the Government, the provision of annual grants for broadcasting service would give the Cabinet immense authority over the level of service to be provided at public expense. A long-term grant, on the other hand, may not always reflect the changing cost of services in a period of rapid technological change or changes in the level of services arising from spectacular changes in the national economy.

A provision of revenue by license fees, in our opinion from what we know about it, has proved to be an expensive way of raising funds in the past and, unless some more economical means of collecting such fees can be evolved, the Wheat Pool would be reluctant to see this method of financing revived. It may be possible to expand the principle of ear-marked taxation by assigning a percentage of some other taxes to the support of radio and television, following the same principle now followed in connection with excise taxes on radio and television sets. Obviously, funds from this source must be pretty close to their peak.

Somehow or other we rather like the idea of expanding this principle of ear-marking a percentage of certain other taxes, possibly other

excise taxes, for this particular purpose.

Incidentally, the Canadian Broadcasting Act provides that grants may be made out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, and it is my understanding that a grant is made today to an extent of some $6¼ million. If that present grant is not adequate, I don't think there is anything sacrosanct about the $6¼ million, and there is no real reason why, if it was important that the $6¼ million should be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund to meet a condition, that additional sums should not also be paid out at the same time.

The important point is that some formula should be established or some form of revenue which will make the broadcasting service as financially independent as possible. It is quite evident that would require the advice of persons who know the mechanics of taxation, etc.

Before closing I would like to make one general observation about radio in Saskatchewan. Our Organization has enjoyed close and harmonious relations with all radio stations for a very long time. We have carried on broadcasting programmes since our inception in 1943, and we have enjoyed the greatest co-operation and courtesy from all the stations with which we have had relationships. We want at this time to express our appreciation, and your Commission to know that we do appreciate the excellent service which radio gives to the farm people of Saskatchewan at the present time and under the present set-up. While television is much newer in

this Province, our contacts with the T.V. stations have been equally satisfactory.

Broadcasting has been a powerful factor in helping to develop a Canadian national spirit in this generation. This Organization believes that telecasting has as great or greater opportunities, along with the continuing contribution which radio may make, to promote a steady Canadianism and to provide information and entertainment for the Canadian people. We believe these worthwhile objectives will be obtained most readily by maintaining a national, unified broadcasting system along the lines of that which now operates in Canada.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Robertson. Mr. Coyne, have you some questions?

MR. COYNE: Mr. Robertson, turning to page 4 of your brief which is headed "The Function of Broadcasting", you say:

> "The achievement of these four criteria
> "in broadcasting within Canada is most
> "likely to be achieved, the Wheat Pool
> "believes, under a public corporation
> "established with very much the same
> "kind and degree of control which the
> "Canadian Broadcasting Corporation now
> "exercises."

I take it that you are primarily referring to the type of development which has taken place in radio and which is more fully developed now that T.V. is beginning?

MR. ROBERTSON: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Would it be true to say that the Wheat Pool would favour the development of television along much the same lines as the radio system has developed?

MR. ROBERTSON: Yes, as a matter of fact, our thinking has been that it is the only sound basis upon which we can develop under conditions as they exist at the present time, a unified system but with the combined forces of the private stations and the C.B.C.-owned stations.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: In other words, a co-operative effort?

MR. ROBERTSON: Co-operative effort, yes.

MR. COYNE: A little further down on that page when you are referring to the sparsely populated nature of rural Saskatchewan, you say:

"Today, the Province is well-served by

"private and public radio stations alike."

I take it that really in terms of service of rural Saskatchewan you draw no distinction in terms of service there which you derive from the public and private stations?

MR. ROBERTSON: Yes, it has given service, but I think today under the system as it exists there is no farm family able to afford a radio who is not in touch with radio. The service has been adequate and it has covered the field and it has been well received.

MR. COYNE: Then, turning to the next page,

you make some comments again following upon the sparse nature of the population in the rural areas, and you suggest that in such circumstances television service is unlikely to be available except under some sort of a national system of public subsidy.

MR. ROBERTSON: With public subsidy, to be quite frank.

MR. COYNE: And you say, without pressing the case, that a case could be made for developing T.V. facilities in areas now served before alternative service is made available in metropolitan centres.

MR. ROBERTSON: That is right, under ordinary circumstances, under circumstances which would exist in the event of the field being wide open for anyone to go into T.V., stations will undoubtedly develop around areas of concentration of population which would leave an enormous stretch of Saskatchewan entirely outside of T.V. service because of the very sparse nature of our settlement. As I say, some of that will be forthcoming by the technological improvements in the not-too-far-distant future. We hope to include CBK at Watrous, which is by no means a large centre of population, and it is quite possible that something of that sort may well be done in television. This is a personal feeling, I should not be discussing it, really.

MR. COYNE: The question I wanted to put to you was this: Representations have been made to the Commission that in some of these metropolitan areas it is practicable today for private interests

to set up alternative stations in these areas at no cost to the public and without interfering with the public service of the C.B.C., and do you think your Organization would see any objection in principle to alternative services being obtained in these metropolitan communities at their own cost?

MR. ROBERTSON: Well, our idea is, some of these things depend on where you start from. As you will have noticed, we started from a definition which was used by the Royal Commission on Art, and we considered it an important task, and it is not important that Winnipeg should have four, five or six T.V. stations and Regina should have one and Watrous none at all; it is not important if the objective is to develop a strong Canadianism. That is one of the important things to be done. Then it seems to me that you justify the employment of these services that may not be available to quite so many Canadians as in the heavier populations, but I suggest Canadians in the sparsely settled areas are just as important to the national economy as the more heavily populated areas. So it may well be that if there is any limitation at all it should be in the heavily populated areas in order to provide accommodation in the less settled areas.

MR. COYNE: That is what you say, that if the establishment of second outlets in the metropolitan areas were to postpone or interfere with the extension of service by the C.B.C. in the sparsely settled areas, then you would argue against the

alternative service for the city dwellers. But supposing this was the situation -- and representations have been made to us to this effect -- that the establishment of a second station by private interests supported wholly by commercial revenue would not interfere in any way with the extension of the services to the sparsely settled areas by the C.B.C., which is the only organization that could extend services to these areas -- in those circumstances do you see any objection in principle to the cities having a second outlet which they are paying for themselves at no charge to the taxpayers?

MR. ROBERTSON: You say at no charge to the taxpayers? I might answer that question by asking another: In the programmes which can be made available to that second station by the C.B.C. -- I am going on the assumption you are going to maintain the same degree of control for T.V. as you have in radio ---

MR. COYNE: No, I am taking a situation where the second station would not be getting C.B.C. service at all, the C.B.C. service would be received through the existing station.

MR. ROBERTSON: I would say that any group who can afford it and who can operate the machine, subject to the rules laid down by an authoritative body, any group that can afford it are entitled to go ahead and operate, but if programmes are to be supplied by the C.B.C. at prices which are less than it would cost that station to provide

their own programme -- and it is always possible that can develop, in other words, the C.B.C. would be subsidizing that private station -- that poses a different question altogether.

MR. COYNE: I was merely assuming, and the matter is not proven -- I was merely saying that this would be at no cost, and I think you answered my question; if those circumstances applied you have no objection?

MR. ROBERTSON: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Well then, when you are referring to the fact that programming should be free from partisan political control and you contrast control by a public corporation with control by a relatively few individuals, now representations have been made to the Commission in support of the principle or the proposition that State control of important media of communication like radio and television is dangerous, and that there is inherently a danger by permitting control of this media to be vested in a State organ.

MR. ROBERTSON: But would it not be more correct to say that the C.B.C. is Parliament-controlled rather than State-controlled?

MR. COYNE: I notice that you draw that distinction between control by a public corporation and control by a department of Government. I wonder if you might elaborate on your views in that suggestion that you made to us?

MR. ROBERTSON: I make the point further, under our system of public financing of public

expenditures, they originate with the Government, is that not correct? And the Government is simply composed of members of the Cabinet, so the first approach on the matter of financing of this kind lies with the members of the Cabinet, and ultimately it goes to Parliament. What we are suggesting is, Parliamentary control as it is at the present time; the C.B.C. reports to Parliament and I think that is important, and I do not think most people realize just the rather subtle difference there is between a State-controlled operation and an operation like the C.B.C. which reports directly to the people's representatives. If you are afraid of a State-controlled broadcasting system, what you mean is you are afraid of Parliament, the democratic institution which we have built up.

MR. COYNE: On this point your Organization draws a distinction between control by a department of the Government and control by a public corporation reporting to Parliament?

MR. ROBERTSON: Yes, we think it is a very important consideration and it is not too well understood in the country.

MR. COYNE: Well, turning to page 7, if you will, where you are dealing with the national system of broadcasting, and at the bottom of this section, immediately before No. 4 you say:

"Further, an effective national radio
"and television service should have both
"the authority to regulate radio and

"television broadcasting and also the
"means to prepare and disseminate pro-
"grammes of its own."

MR. ROBERTSON: I think we are just simply trying to describe and maybe use up a few more words in describing what we have previously described.

MR. COYNE: It has been suggested to us that the preparation and dissemination of programmes is one thing, and the control and regulation of radio and television stations is another, and that the two do not necessarily go together. Could you just give us your idea as to why these two separate functions could not be divided or should not be devided?

MR. ROBERTSON: Well, one would say offhand that in order to exercise the authority, to give effect to the authority, it would be practically essential that the controlling body would -- could not give effect, they could not put their authority into operation in any other way.

MR. COYNE: Their authority in what way? Do you mean their authority to regulate stations, to reserve time for their broadcasts?

MR. ROBERTSON: That is one thing, the authority to regulate radio and television broadcasting in a general way, the authority to say -- and it is a point that I think should be emphasized -- the authority to say between the hours of 6.00 and 11.00 P.M. there shall be a certain type of programme broadcast, and the hours from 6.00 to 11.00 should not be devoted exclusively to commercial

purposes.

MR. COYNE: Of course, in the way this is represented or built up, the body that was making the rules, namely the independent body, would presumably have enforcement machinery, and I don't want to press you unduly, because you have expressed your opinion, but I wanted to see whether there were any particular reasons in principle why this division of functions could not really be accomplished?

MR. ROBERTSON: The interest is different; the essential interest is different. A private radio station -- and I have gone to some pains to explain that we believe the private radio stations have done a real good job in the Province of Saskatchewan -- a private radio station must of necessity operate as a business institution. It must earn or it won't stay in business very long. In order to stay in business it must secure the greatest possible revenue from what it has to sell -- the time on the station -- and C.B.C. must of necessity do the other thing; it must be interested in the development of Canada as a nation; it must be interested in the development of culture, arts and letters and all the rest of the things.

MR. COYNE: So you would say that the C.B.C. is not simply a broadcasting, operating body in the same sense as the private stations?

MR. ROBERTSON: The C.B.C.'s broadcasting activities are actually incidental to the main purpose for which it exists, which is to provide

(Page 1530 follows)

information, education and so forth, as I tried to outline.

MR. COYNE: Then, turning to page 8 -- and this is a small point -- you say, "The Wheat Pool is of the opinion that it is more economical and more efficient to maintain the present system than to extend C.B.C. facilities into every community." I was wondering why you thought it was more efficient? I can see it would be more economical, but why more efficient?

MR. ROBERTSON: If we take the whole sentence there, "A national system implies that the group which is charged ..." -- we are talking about a national system.

MR. COYNE: Yes.

MR. ROBERTSON: "..... charged with the responsibility of promoting the nation's interest should have control of adequate facilities for reaching the maximum number of Canadians." That is the national authority.

MR. COYNE: That is really the point we have been speaking of up to now?

MR. ROBERTSON: Up to now.

MR. COYNE: Yes.

MR. ROBERTSON: As a corporation, but they must have the facilities, and rather than go out and acquire new facilities all over the place, where existing facilities are available it is obvious, as you say, that it would be more economical and therefore it is more efficient.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I don't think the "more efficient" adds much to the "more economical"?

MR. ROBERTSON: No, it is just a tidier job.

MR. COYNE: Very well. Turning to your section on financing at the top of page 9 you refer to commercial sources of revenue and then say, "The Saskatchewan Wheat Pool would be most reluctant to see the radio service obliged to earn all of its revenue from commercial sources or, even, to depend on such sources for a major portion of its funds." The question I wanted to ask you was this: Does your Organization feel that the present proportions, roughly, as between commercially-sponsored programmes and so-called sustaining programmes is about the right proportion? You speak of commercial revenues providing a certain proportion.

MR. ROBERTSON: I am not sure we would have sufficient information to be able to give a considered opinion.

MR. COYNE: You are not, in fact, making any suggestion that, for example, the present commercial activity of the C.B.C. should be increased or, on the other hand, that it should be decreased?

MR. ROBERTSON: No. You have pretty capable people in the C.B.C. and they should have some freedom of choice in these matters.

MR. COYNE: A little further down on this same page, where you are speaking of the present excise taxes on radio and television sets which are ear-marked to the C.B.C., you say, "The latter tax

seems eminently fair, inasmuch as it is paid by persons who benefit from the service." Do you agree that the same statement could be made with respect to an annual license fee which again would be paid by the persons who benefitted from the service?

MR. ROBERTSON: Oh yes, I think that is correct. The only thing we have against the idea of a license fee is simply that it has been demonstrated that it is not an economical method; the cost of raising the money is out of proportion to the amount of money collected.

MR. COYNE: So your view is that although it may be a fair way to finance the operation, it is not really a practical or feasible way to do it?

MR. ROBERTSON: It is not an efficient operation, that is correct.

MR. COYNE: Just one other question that arises on page 10, where you raise the possibility of expanding the principle of ear-marked taxation, and you commented on this aspect of it in your earlier presentation. I was going to ask you this: wouldn't you feel that to ear-mark a portion of some tax that perhaps bears no relation to broadcasting would not be an effective way of giving the C.B.C. any certainty as to their revenues? Tax rates go up and down, and if all they are getting is a portion of some tax receipt, it is not a very firm financial foundation, is it, for anybody to plan on?

MR. ROBERTSON: No, it isn't. It all hinges on this objective of television broadcasting;

all hinges on what you are trying to do.

THE CHAIRMAN: But, Mr. Robertson, let us assume we accept your objective of providing a broad national service in broadcasting and television; you, at page 10, do say, "The important point, however, in the opinion of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, is to find some formula or some source of revenue which will make the broadcasting service as financially independent as possible." And prior to that you were suggesting that ear-marked taxes or excise taxes and some other ear-marked taxes may be a good way to do this. It seems to me these two points are inconsistent, because Mr. Coyne was pointing out to you that the ear-marking of taxes does not make the C.B.C. financially independent, and that is the very trouble we are faced with at the moment, the declining revenue from the present excise taxes which are creating deficits for which there is no provision.

MR. ROBERTSON: The expression "financially independent" may not be quite as happy as it was intended to be.

THE CHAIRMAN: But isn't it implicit in your basic argument that you want them financially independent?

MR. ROBERTSON: As financially independent as possible.

THE CHAIRMAN: But the method ought to be such as to enable them to do their job?

MR. ROBERTSON: That is it, that the funds should be available.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. Coyne's question is merely pointing out to you that you are favouring an ear-marking of taxes, and that does not seem to go along very well with this business of being financially independent.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: We had a suggestion, and I think it was in Winnipeg, where somebody suggested that we might ear-mark a percentage of the total revenues of the Government as a grant to the Corporation, but there again you are faced with the rise and fall of revenues from one year to another, and as a result you have no actual figure that the Corporation could rely on from year to year.

MR. ROBERTSON: No. The swing is too great.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Yes.

MR. ROBERTSON: I did take out some figures on excise taxes of things like spirits and tobacco and cigarettes.

MR. COYNE: I think you did say when you were speaking about Parliamentary grants, or statutory grants, that as far as the Wheat Pool was concerned there was no magic in this $6¼ million?

MR. ROBERTSON: Yes, that is correct.

MR. COYNE: And I take it from that that you have no objection in principle to that sum of money being paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund to the C.B.C. to support its operations?

MR. ROBERTSON: If there is no other source available, yes. That is just the type of

situation which nationally and internationally this world is faced with today. The importance of the thing is such that in order to do the job of work -- and I have just come back from Europe and I am a little perturbed about a lot of things -- the importance of having things ready to meet any contingency that comes along would warrant a development of that kind.

MR. COYNE: You said that if no other source was available?

MR. ROBERTSON: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Would you also not say, if no other source as good as a separate grant is available?

MR. ROBERTSON: That would be right.

THE CHAIRMAN: I take it the reason you put out the grant and saw the Revenue Fund as your last resort is the fact that you are disturbed by the difficulty of annual votes, or something like annual votes, which may affect the independence of the broadcasting service?

MR. ROBERTSON: That is correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Robertson, thank you very much for the brief. It is a most interesting one and we will give it consideration.

MR. ROBERTSON: Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: This concludes our list for today, and I want to thank those who have come here both as presenters of briefs and also as members of the audience. We appreciate the interest

and we will give these consideration.

We will now adjourn to Vancouver for opening on Monday morning at 10.00 o'clock.

---The Commission adjourned at 5.10 P.M. until Monday, May 14th, 1956, at Vancouver.

I N D E X

SUBMISSION OF:	Page
SASKATCHEWAN DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION	1374
Miss G. Murray Mr. H. Janzen	
CANADIAN FEDERATION OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN	1396
Miss Marion Gilroy	
SASKATCHEWAN ARTS BOARD	1409
Mrs. W.L. Oddie Mr. S.S. Boyling Mr. K.G. Aberdeen Mrs. F.B. James	
BOTHWELL-HILL CO. LIMITED	1437
Mr. G.R. Bothwell	
L'ASSOCIATION CATHOLIQUE FRANCO-CANADIENNE DE SASKATCHEWAN	1458
M. Dumont LePage	
LA SOCIETE RADIO-GRAVELBOURG LIMITEE	1472
Dr. Rosario Morin	
SASKATCHEWAN PROVINCIAL COMMITTEE LABOUR PROGRESSIVE PARTY	1487
Mrs. Nelson Clarke	
SUBMISSION BY A GROUP OF REGINA HOUSEWIVES	1501
Phyllis Levin Juliet Shapiro June Mitchell	
SASKATCHEWAN WHEAT POOL	1509
Mr. B.W. Robertson	

INDEX TO EXHIBITS

No.	Description	Page
58	Brief presented by Saskatchewan Department of Education	1375
59	Brief of Canadian Federation of University Women	1396
60	Brief of the Saskatchewan Arts Board	1409
61	Brief of Bothwell-Hill Co. Limited	1437
62	Brief submitted by l'Association Catholique Franco-Canadienne de Saskatchewan	1458
63	Brief submitted by La Societe Radio-Gravelbourg Limitee	1472
64	Brief filed by Saskatchewan Provincial Committee of the Labour Progressive Party	1488
65	Brief of a group of Regina Housewives	1502
66	Brief of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool	1509

ROYAL COMMISSION

ON

BROADCASTING

HEARINGS

HELD AT

VANCOUVER, B.C. MAY 14, 1956

V. 10

ROYAL COMMISSION ON BROADCASTING

Vancouver, B.C.,
May 14, 1956.

PRESENT:

THE CHAIRMAN	ROBERT M. FOWLER
COMMISSIONER	EDMOND TURCOTTE
COMMISSIONER	JAMES STEWART

COMMISSION COUNSEL	JAMES M. COYNE A. J. deGRANDPRE

SECRETARY	PAUL PELLETIER

SUBMISSIONS BY:

Tom Goode, M.P. — Individual brief.

UNIVERSITY OF B.C. TELEVISION COMMITTEE

Mr. G.C. Andrew, Chairman
Major J.F. McLean
Dr. Marion B. Smith
Dr. A. Earle Birney

B.C. PARENT-TEACHERS FEDERATION
Mrs. W.W. McDonald
Mrs. A.F. Cliff
Mrs. A.H. Young

STATION CKLG, NORTH VANCOUVER
R.T. Bowman, Manager

KELOWNA ARTS COUNCIL
Miss Linsey Crossley

STATION CKWX, VANCOUVER
Mr. F.H. Elphicke, Vice President and General Manager
Mr. S.G. Ross, Assistant Manager.

Hearings of the Royal Commission on Broadcasting held at Vancouver, B.C., commencing on Monday, May 14, 1956.

---On resuming at 10.00 a.m.:

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, ladies and gentlemen, we will start the Vancouver hearings of the Commission, and I would like to say a word about our procedure. We will try to start at 10.00 a.m. in the morning and carry through until around 12.30, resume at 2.30 and continue until 4.30 or 5.00 o'clock each day until we finish the sitting, to hear the briefs that are to be presented here in Vancouver.

We have a number of briefs to hear, some

(continued on Page 1539)

dozen of them I think. We have also received a number of briefs that have been sent in to us that will be considered, but those who have presented them do not wish to make formal presentation.

I would like to repeat something I said at the outset in Ottawa as to our method of procedure. We are trying our best to get at the facts, and find the issues. To do that we feel we should, and will, question the witnesses. Perhaps I might just read a couple of paragraphs from my opening statement in Ottawa.

"To do this I think we will have to have "searching and detailed questioning, and we "intend to do that, but you will all see "very quickly the dangers of that kind of "procedure. Whatever witnesses are appear- "ing before us at the moment will be "questioned by our counsel and by us to "elicit his views. Such questions may have "the appearance of being opposed to the "stated views of the witness who happens "to be before us."

Then a little later on I say:

"I hope that no one will try to read into "any question any indication that the "Commission has reached a conclusion on "any point. We will reach no conclusion "until all the evidence is in, and we "will give our best study to the issues "raised in the terms of reference."

I think we will continue to proceed in

that way even though there has been some misinterpretation of the questions along the line that one or other of the Commissioners has expressed a viewpoint or reached a conclusion. I repeat we have reached no conclusions.

SUBMISSION OF TOM GOODE, M.P. (Individual Brief.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The first brief we are to hear is from Mr. T.H. Goode, Member of Parliament.

Mr. Goode, we are very glad to have you with us. We have had a member of one of the Legislative Assemblies, but I think you are the first Member of Parliament in Ottawa that has appeared before us. Your submission in brief form has been received and we will begin by marking it as Exhibit No. 67.

EXHIBIT NO. 67: Brief by Mr. Tom Goode, M.P.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, from there, Mr. Goode, it is in your hands as to how you go forward. You may either summarize or read the brief as seems best to you.

MR. GOODE: Mr. Chairman, I would prefer, with your permission, to read my brief on the understanding, of course, as you have just stated, that I place myself in the hands of the Commission for questioning immediately after I have completed it. Is that satisfactory to you?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. GOODE: Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen: I wish to thank you most sincerely for the time that you have alloted to me in presenting my views and the views of the Reeve and Council of the Municipality of Burnaby, B.C., and those of the President and the Executive of the South Burnaby Board of Trade also of Burnaby, B.C., who are associated in this submission. Although this brief has been prepared in Ottawa, it represents the thinking of not only myself but the two bodies I have mentioned, and it is offered to assist this Commission in arriving at a conclusion satisfactory to the people of Canada.

I also wish to take this opportunity of thanking the Commission for the courtesies extended to me by Mr. Paul Pelletier, the Secretary to the Commission. Your Secretary has been most helpful in arranging a date that would be satisfactory for me to leave the House of Commons, come to the coast and return to Ottawa.

Mr. Pelletier has provided me with the terms of reference of this Commission, and I will try to keep my remarks not only brief but bound to clause "F", which reads:

"The Royal Commission on Broadcasting was directed to examine and make representations upon the licensing and control of private television in the public interest".

In presenting our joint views today, we

wish to bring to the attention of the Commission the growth that has taken place in British Columbia in the last fifteen years.

1. From 1946 to 1950 under the National Housing Act alone 10,843 homes were erected in our province.

2. From 1951-1955 an additional 16,892 separate dwellings were constructed.

3. The number of people employed in British Columbia today is 227,890 with a weekly average wage rate of $67.30, the highest in Canada.

To give the Commission an example of the population growth of our province I simply wish to refer you to the population increase in the Municipality of Burnaby, which in a very short space of years has arrived at over 80,000 people, the second largest populated area in our province.

When I tell you that not more than twenty years ago the Municipality that I represent in the House of Commons included in its makeup a large area of bush country, and to-day represents a congregation of beautiful homes, you will understand that British Columbia today is a different place even than it was five years ago.

All this home development and all the capital construction expenditure in our province has quite rightly given to our people that thought that the future belongs to British Columbia. On every side of our economy progress goes on. It would

be most difficult to mention any specific business transaction that is not operating at a considerable benefit to the people of our province, and to those who have made investment in that business. Today each British Columbian realizes that we have a wonderful province, and that our future is guaranteed just as long as the prosperity of Canada progresses as it has in the last twenty years, and in realizing the progress of our province - the thinking of the people is one of pride, and may be somewhat of independence. They say in the east of our country, yes, indeed, in the House of Commons, that British Columbians are independent in thought and in deed.

This independence of thought is also reflected in the services that we demand in the entertainment field, and especially in the field of television. I am informed there are 150,000 homes in British Columbia equipped with television at a total investment to our people of thirty million dollars. Business directories will inform this Commission that there are over three hundred dealers in television sets and repair work for television on the lower mainland in British Columbia alone, employing some twenty-five hundred people, in a capital investment of over thirty-five millions of dollars on the day that I speak to this Commission.

Television then in our province is becoming

a very important industry, it is difficult to proceed to any part of Vancouver, Burnaby or Richmond and there not find some individual or individuals who are interested in the television business. I am sure that television in British Columbia is fast becoming one of our principal retail businesses. All this has been obtained not because of Canadian television but of United States television. The Commission will know that we have one Canadian Broadcasting Corporation outlet, C.B.U. T.V., in Vancouver operating, I suggest to you, in a manner that fits the needs of a minority of our television viewers. There are some homes on the lower mainland of British Columbia who cannot receive C.B.U. T.V., and who depend entirely upon television from a foreign country.

I have been a member of two successive broadcasting committees in the House of Commons and in those committees I have tried to bring to the attention of the House the peculiar situation that exists in British Columbia. The Commission will realize that we will have private television in British Columbia. One station has lately been licensed in Victoria, but that station under present arrangements will be a low powered station and is not intended to effect the Vancouver market, so it can be said for my argument that we on the lower mainland of British Columbia have one Canadian station.

It will be understood by the Commission the effective hours of broadcasting in any television outlet is from six p.m. to ten p.m. These are the hours that sponsors require to use for their purposes, four hours with an average of eight sponsored programs.

I raise no objection and have heard none in regard to the suggestion of sponsored programs on C.B.U. T.V., in fact the opposite is true, for more sponsors wish to use the facilities than the station can accommodate. The public realize that without sponsored programs, television would be even more costly to the nation than it is today. It can be said here that some would-be sponsors are not being treated fairly by being unable to advertise their competitive products on C.B.C. television in Vancouver because if I am correct in saying that there are four available hours of sponsored television in Vancouver, then I am correct when I say only eight firms can be taken care of in one evening. I am informed that the statement can be substantiated in the reports of the radio committee of the House in 1955 that there is a long waiting list of sponsors for programs on C.B.C. in Vancouver. I suggest to you that it is not fair competition that one firm selling one specific product cannot receive the same treatment. I don't think this is free enterprise and frankly I don't think it is fair. Those firms who are in competition with the sponsors on

Canadian television in British Columbia must, to protect their product, their payroll, and their employees, find another outlet for their advertising on television.

There are stations in the United States who will accept this money, and who are eager to do so, and who will offer the services that are needed in business competition. One station is the United States television outlet in Bellingham in Washington K.V.O.S. T.V. whose Canadian intake in dollars is many thousands of dollars per month. (I have heard $90,000 mentioned).

If the Commission can find the time to channel into this station on any given night they will find that most of the programs are taken up by Canadian sponsors, and so we find the ridiculous situation of Canadian money being sent to Bellingham to beam back programs promoting the sale of Canadian products to Canadian people. As I have told you British Columbians are essentially of an independent nature, and they resent the fact that British Columbia payrolls in the industrial field must be supplemented by advertising beamed to them by U.S. television stations selling B.C. products.

I am not one who will say that American money should not come into Canada, I believe that any young country needs foreign money, but I have

to hear an effective argument and a like situation where citizens of one country have to send their money to another country to sell their own products to their own people, and that simply is what is happening in television in British Columbis today. Without Bellingham television many firms would suffer severe income losses in competition with firms who cannot advertise on C.B.C. T.V. I am not in a position to suggest to this Commission how C.B.U. T.V. decides on its sponsored programs. From observation I think the sponsors are all very responsible people, but I do suggest to you that accommodation should be found for those sponsors of British Columbian products to advertise their products by Canadian television, and when I say that I must have an answer for you.

The only possible answer is to allow private television into the lower mainland of British Columbia. You may ask me whether there is a channel available for that television and I can say to you that channel 8 has been allocated for British Columbia lower mainland purposes.

The argument has been made before this Commission that C.B.C. cannot survive if private competition is allowed in the television field. The C.B.C. may have said that to this Commission but they have never been able to convince a committee of the House of Commons that this is so. If the C.B.C.

needed more finance in the years from their incorporation in television to the present moment, why have they not been charging adequate rates to private operators in Ontario for the programs allotted to a large number of private television stations in that province? Why, in fact, has private television been allowed in one province and not in another? The statement has been made to the Radio Committee of the House of Commons that the C.B.C. have been very careful in not allowing overlapping between their Toronto station and those stations in Kitchener, Windsor, Hamilton, etc., and I can inform this Commission that I have personally viewed television from private stations in the City of Toronto itself. I suggest to you that British Columbia is entitled to the services offered to any other province in Canada, and I suggest to you that the way to do that in this field is to allow private television in the lower mainland area.

This brings me to the point on whether money is available from private sources to install television transmitters and studios on the mainland. I can say to this Commission that the people of Burnaby as well as their Member of Parliament can guarantee that at least four radio stations operating now in British Columbia are interested in building a private television station in Burnaby as soon as a licence application is permitted. I can tell you that millions of dollars are available for that purpose, and I have that in writing. I also have the

assurance that the Burnaby Municipal Council will provide space on Burnaby Mountain which is one of the finest installation areas known in Canada. The only proof I must give you now is whether our people want a private television station.

This year in the House of Commons I presented a petition including 13,333 names of heads of households in the lower mainland asking for a private television station in Burnaby, B.C. On an average basis these names represented families that would include over 50,000 people, and I can assure you that the South Burnaby Board of Trade could organize another petition, the signatures representing 50,000 families, and so I have told you that the initiative is there for private television. The money is there for private television and all the people of British Columbia ask is that they have an alternate station to receive on their sets should there be a program on C.B.C. that does not meet with their approval.

One other question I wish to bring to your attention is this matter of competition. The C.B.C. before successive committees of the House of Commons have said that competition would ruin the system of government owned stations throughout Canada. Surely with the talent available to C.B.C., with their long experience in the television and radio field, and with the money that has been made available by the taxpayers

of Canada, if they have not solidified their position after all these years to the point where compeition would not be effective then it is time for the C.B.C. to get out of the entertainment field. With millions and millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money behind them why should a vast organization with the top technical personnel in the country be afraid of private operators?

That is the only explanation I can give for their repeated statements both to this Commission and to the House of Commons committee that they don't welcome competition in their field. I think that if I were the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation I would welcome competition because surely they have been in the television business long enough to be able to corral every good program in the United States or Canada. Surely private television is going to have a very difficult time of availing themselves of the proper program content to interest the viewers, and yet there has been a constant fight on the part of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to keep private television from British Columbia.

I am of the opinion that a private station, say in Burnaby, could support the employment of more local talent - could give the people more local sports - more church services - more viewings on matters of local interest. I

have tried to interest the C.B.C. in televising winter programs based on our wonderful summer shows, "Theatre under the Stars" without success. This is the finest show of its kind in Canada, and a private television station certainly would be interested.

If we have citizens in our province who have the large sums of money available to build a private television station, then I say let them do it, if they don't provide the programs that will interest our people it is a simple matter to change your channel dial to C.B.C. or to a United States program, but I am positive that I represent the feeling of the people who sent me to the House of Commons when I say we resent Canadian money going to the United States to sell Canadian products back to Canadians, and our people insist that the time has now come when under a system of free enterprise the people of British Columbia shall be allowed to make application for a private television station, that those applications be considered by the Government of Canada, and that the application presented to the government which is considered most responsible be allowed to enter into competition with the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation on the lower mainland.

Gentlemen, I thank you for listening to me, you have heard many technical briefs, and will hear more. I deliberately set out on a course in this brief that will stay away from technicalities, and

would present the true picture as I know it in British Columbia. Some people may argue that I am wrong, most of our citizens will tell you that I am right, and I have presented this brief in the interests of the people I represent because I view the position as Member of Parliament as carrying an obligation to present those views whenever and wherever I get the opportunity.

I want to comment on the suggestion made to this Commission by the Canadain Broadcasting Corporation that each individual television owner in Canada be charged a large licence fee. I oppose this strenuously, as do most of my colleagues in the House of Commons.

If the C.B.C. require additional expenditures for services may I suggest they come to Parliament and prove their case. I have no personal knowledge of the C.B.C. ever being refused essentail monies by Parliament.

I thank you, gentlemen, on behalf of Reeve MacSorley of Burnaby and Mr. George Nichols, Secretary of the South Burnaby Board of Trade, and I appreciate your courtesty to me.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Goode. I apologize to Mr. Nichols for not having recorded his presence when we opened; Mr. George F. Nichols, Secretary-Treasurer of the South Burnaby Board of Trade is with you? Have you anything to add, Mr. Nichols?

MR. NICHOLS: All I can say is, the South Burnaby Board of Trade support this brief in its entirety. I would like to refer to a resolution that was passed at the Canadian Board of Trade meeting where I was sitting next to you, Mr. Chairman, and it says that radio and television offer two of the main information channels of communication and the Chambers of Commerce believe that no principal or organization in any field should be both competitor and regulator, and urges the establishment of a separate regulatory board having minimum, essential regulatory powers over radio and television broadcasting in Canada. In this regard we support this brief in its entirety.

THE CHAIRMAN: Who is to ask the questions?

MR. COYNE: I will, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Goode, turning to page 3 of your brief, the paragraph that begins about the middle of that page, you say:

"This independence of thought is also
"reflected in the services that we de-
"mand in the entertainment field and
"especially in the field of television."

Would you say that television is wholly or primarily a vehicle for entertainment?

MR. GOODE: No, Mr. Chairman, I would not. I think that television is a vehicle not only for entertainment but for education. I have stayed away from the educational part of the brief knowing that the Parent-Teachers' Association were going to follow me, and I thought you would hear from experts far better qualified than I in that field. That is why I stayed away from it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am glad you put this qualification in, because I was sure that your brief in dealing, as it does, with entertainment to begin with and later with the merchandising of goods, that you are not leaving out of consideration entirely several other factors -- not only education, but another one we have had presented is the matter of increasing national knowledge and national unity through the medium of television and radio, and I think it is well that you added that to the over-all picture.

MR. COYNE: Just following on the same subject, Mr. Goode, do you think that there is any likelihood that private television stations operated of necessity on a commercial basis would tend to concentrate on programmes of entertainment, perhaps of the lighter kind, and tend to neglect the fields of education and cultural advancement?

MR. GOODE: Mr. Chairman, I have taken some time because I anticipated a question of that

kind and I have been to Sudbury and Kitchener and to Hamilton, and as this Commission knows, a man does not express his opinions unless he at least tries to find out the facts. I found that in the field of private television in Ontario that these stations are doing a tremendous job of work in their own communities and, frankly, I do not think that the C.B.C. can cover that field as well as the owner of a television station who is personally living in the town, knowing the local conditions. I do not think the C.B.C. can cover that field nearly as well as private television. I have just lately come from Sudbury; I heard they had an excellent station but I wanted to see it for myself, and I did, and they turned the facilities of the station over to me. I went through on a weekend when the House was not sitting and I stayed through with them all day. The work they were doing with the children of Sudbury is something the C.B.C. could not possibly do, and we do not expect them to do. If all private stations could be conducted as Sudbury is, then I think the people of Canada would be happy with private television.

MR. COYNE: Do you think the good service which the station in Sudbury and, let us say, the station in Hamilton -- and what was the other place?

MR. GOODE: Kitchener.

MR. COYNE: Kitchener, yes, are able to provide is related in any way to the fact that they

are part of the C.B.C. network and receiving a substantial portion of their programming from the C.B.C.?

MR. GOODE: Oh, yes.

MR. COYNE: What I have in mind is this: In those centres in Ontario the private stations are part of the C.B.C. network whereas, presumably, if second private stations were established in metropolitan areas they would not be part of the C.B.C. network and would not receive programming from the C.B.C.

MR. GOODE: Mr. Chairman, I do not think he -- I believe that private television stations should be part of the C.B.C. network.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is the point I wanted to get clear. In other words, the second station you are asking for in the Vancouver area would be a part of the national television system operated by the C.B.C. in the same way that Sudbury, Kitchener and Hamilton are?

MR. GOODE: Yes, certainly, I put that in the brief, so any remarks you may have heard of mine in other places, you may think that I was anti-C.B.C., but that is not true. My point is that the people in Canada -- and I point my argument to British Columbia only -- I think the people of British Columbia on the lower mainland are entitled to Canadian facilities. If the C.B.C. were prepared to put in another station here I do not think I would argue against that. After all, it is Canada and we want Canadian facilities, but I do not think

that is possible, and the only other alternative I can offer to this Commission in helping -- and that is what I am here for -- is that our people under our system should be allowed to spend their money and if our viewers look at that private station and are not satisfied with the programmes, as I have said in my brief, it is the easiest thing in the world to walk across the room and turn it off; and you would know that if the private television cannot command the viewing of the majority of the people in our Province they will go out of business, because we won't advertise with that station.

THE CHAIRMAN: You would not confine your statement of facilities to people on the lower mainland, that would apply to all Canadians, would it not?

MR. GOODE: That would be a matter for this Commission. I have heard it said that we should not have additional facilities until the rest of Canada, some isolated part of Canada, get their primary television viewing. I cannot agree with that point of view. We might say in that case that my municipality of Burnaby or Richmond must not have further roads until we get them further north of Prince George. I cannot support that argument, I cannot support the argument that Vancouver should not have additional entertainment facilities until someone in northern British Columbia gets is. Why hold the heavy-populated area waiting for something to happen in the north?

THE CHAIRMAN: Involving public expenditures?

MR. GOODE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: By the Dominion?

MR. GOODE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Well, it has been put forward to us, Mr. Goode, that to put in a private station, whether or not it is financed by private individuals locally or not, costs the Government, or the C.B.C., $100,000 for each private station per year. These figures we are having checked for ourselves to find out how they are made up, but that has been said to us. Now, if that is the case and we say in our recommendations there should be alternate service here, there and everywhere at a rather large expense to the Government which might result with that large expenditure -- retard the progress of television or keep out television in a number of places on the Prairies; would you still feel that there should be alternate service in the larger centres to the exclusion, not necessarily of isolated parts of Canada, but those places in Manitoba and Saskatchewan that are not covered now?

MR. GOODE: Take the first part, I do not think a private station should cost the taxpayers of Canada $100,000.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Well, that is a figure that has been given to us.

MR. GOODE: I know it is because I followed your activities across Canada. If a private

television station is going to get facilities from the C.B.C. which they must, then I should think they should pay 100% for every accommodation they get. This matter of allowing C.B.C. programmes, and good programmes, to go to private television for less than their cost does not receive any reasoning from me. I believe if private television is to use C.B.C. facilities they should pay for them and we should take a profit on it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you apply this to the present private stations that are now operating as well as to any new ones?

MR. GOODE: Yes, sir. Just because someone is doing business with the Government of Canada does not say, in my mind, that they have to do that at an expense to the taxpayers of Canada. If John Smith who is operating a private station and wants to use C.B.C. facilities, I think you should use some of them, then he will pay money for it or stay out of the television field.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: There is another angle brought forward on that both by the C.B.C. and other operators, but it has been stressed, I think, more by the C.B.C. than by the private operators, and that is that the C.B.C. are charged by the Government with the task of providing the country with a national television system, that these people who operate private stations are complementary to the system, they save the Government actually a certain amount of money by having these stations there

and in that way the Government are not required to put up a station and consequently -- and Mr. Dunton made a point of it -- he did not feel that the C.B.C., through giving programmes to these private stations, was subsidizing, they were complementing the C.B.C., saving a certain amount of expense to the Government in order that the C.B.C. could give a national broadcasting system without having a station in every place. I think we should make that clear because there seems to be unanimity of opinion between the private operators and the C.B.C.

MR. GOODE: Mr. Chairman, this point must not be lost; in answering a question of mine in 1955 Mr. Dunton said to me that the C.B.C. had now completed capital construction of televisions stations in Canada. I enlarged on that, and it will be found on the record, that the number of stations you have now is the complete network for the C.B.C. and he said "yes."

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to get that. Did he mean both that the complete network -- stations owned by the C.B.C. -- I do not think he meant to say there would not be an expansion of the network through private stations.

MR. GOODE: Oh no, he meant C.B.C. stations. Now, if that is true, where are we going? I think, with all due respect to this Commission, I think we are going to have to allow private installations in Canada; then, if they provide the installation, all right. Are the taxpayers of Canada and the Government going to be asked to spend more and more money

on this thing? I do not agree with it. I think if private television is to come to Canada, it has got to pay its own way or I will be one much against it. If they have the money to put into private television stations, let them run a trial balance as you and I would in a business and pay the C.B.C. for the facilities given to them.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, the argument that is put to us -- I am only giving this to you to get your views on it -- is that if the programmes were supplied to the private stations and paid for by them, it would either mean that private stations would not be able to stay in business in a country as sparsely settled and as expensive to operate as Canada, or there would be a very substantial degradation of the quality of programmes. In other words, the statement you are making about the necessity of paying the way means one or other of those alternatives as it has been presented to us.

MR. GOODE: Well, my presentation to you would be -- and I have never argued this -- that we should allow private stations in every corner of our nation, as Mr. Fowler has just said, and I take it from what he said -- and I would certainly agree with it -- that the time has not yet come for private television to be put in every small city or town in Canada because it won't pay, but it will pay in the large urban centres; it will pay, in my opinion, in Vancouver, and if it would not pay there would not be so many people who wanted to build that

station. The C.B.C. at the moment depends on 50% of its programmes from the United States. I think the private station would not depend on that percentage, but it would be a high percentage of United States programmes, and for what reason? The reason is, we have neither the talent or the availability of Canadian programmes yet; we will have in fifteen or twenty years but not now. As the C.B.C. have told us in committee, they are depending -- let us take some examples of programmes, because it seems to me the quality of programme, I am sure, is one of the basic things that we have to think of. Let us take the national news service; that is represented to us as being a very valuable thing in bringing of news of all parts of the country to all parts of the country and also international problems with which Canada has great concern.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, how can that pay its way?

MR. GOODE: Well, how has it paid its way in radio? We have the national news on C.B.C. radio.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am only sticking television in order to ---

MR. GOODE: If I may be allowed to point out, I remember the argument and I am quite sure the Commission does in the days gone by when that news broadcast of C.B.C. radio, an excellent one -- it was told to a lot of people that it would have to go through every private station. I do not

see any reason now why my argument on this principle is not sound. If C.B.C. wanted to continue on with a news broadcast, and I think they should on television, what is to stop the private operator from having a broadcast of local events? That is what I tried to say in my brief, the operators of the private bradcasts could have local conditions and news and church services and a lot of other things. There are a lot of things, local news, across the country that C.B.C. cannot pick out. I would not think there is any question about that.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you are getting away from my question. I was asking you if you considered, first of all, that a broad coverage of national news service is a desirable part of the C.B.C. broadcasting system, and I understood you to say you thought it was.

MR. GOODE: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: And, therefore, almost by definition should be carried. Let us stick to television, on television stations it is part of the tying together as a nation; well, how does it get paid for?

MR. GOODE: I would not agree it should be carried by every station, I do not think it is necessary. You see, here comes the competition angle; if people want to see C.B.C. news they channel to C.B.C.; if they like the news on a private station because it is of a local character, then they will turn to the private station. There is no

competition between the two as I see it. Both of them will live or die on the quality of the presentation to the people. There is nothing to stop C.B.C. news magazine being on at 7.00 o'clock in Vancouver and a private television station having news at 7.00 o'clock of a different kind entirely. The people will choose what they want, and I personally would want to see the C.B.C.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us take the stations who do wish to take the C.B.C. news, who pays for it?

MR. GOODE: Do the private stations not pay?

THE CHAIRMAN: No.

MR. GOODE: Well, they should. Why should we give private television operators these facilities to operate a station at profit at the expense of the taxpayer of Canada? I cannot see that and I never have been able to see it and I cannot see it now. If a private station carries C.B.C. news broadcasts, then they should pay for it; the taxpayer of Canada should not, to allow a profit to some individual who put his money into a private station.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Do you think they should be compelled to carry the news service?

MR. GOODE: I do. For instance, in Sudbury where there is no likelihood of a second television station for many, many years, I think that station should be obligated to carry the national news programming. The C.B.C. news is a good

programme; I enjoy it and I am sure the people of Sudbury enjoy it, but that operator should pay for it. He would have to pay for his own news broadcast, why not pay for something you and I provide?

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: It is likely to be expensive.

MR. GOODE: Let it be expensive. That man is in that television station for one reason only, to make a profit, and not make a profit at the expense of you and I.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us take a farm broadccast of which we have heard a good deal from the last place we were in, Regina, where a lot was said about the value of the farm broadcast to the rural communities. That forms part of the national service. Would you think that the private stations should similarly have the requirement that they are paying for the farm broadcast, the rest of them were not taking it?

MR. GOODE: That would have to be a matter of -- I am not a farmer, I would think there would be something in the broadcast to Regina, Moose Jaw and Saskatoon which would be considered of local importance. Certainly a fine programme on the low-powered Victoria station, if I was a private operator I would like to look at that very closely, I would not want to be forced to carry that; but it could be in the interest of the viewers of my station to carry it, and if I did carry it I should pay for it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we could go through

a whole series of this kind of public service broadcasts, and I take it from what you say your general view would be that the private station, radio or television, should either pay the cost or his share of the cost of that programme or else be free not to take it. My question to you is: Why would any private station operator who, as you say, is in business for only one reason, to make a profit, to quote you -- why would he take any part of these public service programmes if he could sell advertising?

MR. GOODE: Well, it has worked out -- I must go back again to the radio field to give you an example -- it has worked out very well in the radio field and I see no reason why it could not work out in the television field. Radio stations here are under a certain amount of control of the C.B.C., and I have never heard a complaint about that control.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have.

MR. GOODE: Well, I have not, and I have been rather close to the radio and television business and I have never heard a genuine complaint about C.B.C. control. I hope the C.B.C. does not lose this control over television. Whether that control be taken over by the C.B.C. or an independent body is not for me to say, being a politician; if I was not a politician I might say something about it, but I must not say that to this Commission.

THE CHAIRMAN: I wish I were a politician.

MR. GOODE: Well, I shall say this, if it is of any help to you, from a man who has perhaps

learned a little about it; that I hope the people of Canada through this Commission or through the Government will neverallow either radio or television to get out of the control of the people, whether it is being run by an independent body -- which has been suggested -- or by the C.B.C. I am not qualified to know which, I have argued against it in the House because I wanted to find out and sometimes that is the only way to get information, but I hope that control never leaves us; and if we think as the people of Canada certain private television stations should carry broadcasts, C.B.C. news, then that control should be there to do it.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are very grateful to you and have more questions, but on this point, it is very helpful to have your views and I think it is only fair to state that in the various statements we have had I do not think there is any great disagreement except on questions of timing. The question Mr. Coyne started with you, and we have gone a little away from there, was the question as to whether the alternative service, the second station in television should go into an area such as Vancouver before other areas in Canada have received any service involving an expenditure of public monies.

MR. GOODE: Well, I would say in answer to that: Let us not penalize the lower mainland of British Columbia because some other parts of the country cannot finance television, C.B.C. or private. This part of our Province is growing rapidly, as you

can see, and we are entitled to further outlets on television. I dislike very much our money having to go to the United States to be beamed back to us, and that is an argument no one has gone against me on. I do not want to see our people in business having to go to the United States, friendly though they may be, to beam back our products to us. If we can do something about it, keep our own money in our own country, then the money I have spent coming from Ottawa will be well worth it.

MR. COYNE: Will you go on? Turning to page 4, towards the bottom of the page where you are speaking on sponsorship of programmes during the evening, and you say:

"These are the hours that sponsors require
"to use for their purposes, four hours with
"an average of eight sponsored programmes."

I would like to ask you whether you mean that all evening programmes should be sponsored programmes? We have had it suggested that sponsorship affects the nature of the programme to some extent in the sense that a sponsor is only interested in a programme which will reach the widest possible audience, whereas some of the worthwhile programmes in other than the light entertainment field do not attract that wide an audience and, therefore, do not attract commercial sponsorship. Do you feel, or do you mean by this statement to suggest, that in the evening hours all programmes should be sponsored and of the type which attracts commercial sponsorship?

MR. GOODE: My answer to that is this: The more unsponsored programmes, if that is a proper word, the more that we have of this Canadian television the more money it is going to cost us. The budget is increasing every year and in the House we are very worried about the cost of the C.B.C. not knowing, as amateurs, what to do about it too much, but every year it is becoming more. Now, there is only one way we can take care of that expenditure, one way I have spoken to you of; if you allow private television, then private television should pay for the facilities; if we are going to receive that type of entertainment in Canada on television, whether we like it or not, or the people like it or not, we are going to have to have sponsored programmes paying the cost of those programmes. There is only one other alternative, that the budget of the C.B.C. in the House of Commons is going to go up and up. I do not like to see somebody's toothpaste advertised every few minutes or somebody's beer, from a United States programme -- I dislike that, I do not like it for my kiddies either, but what are they going to do? Charge the people of Canada for these programmes or industrial firms? In my thinking there is no intermediate way.

THE CHAIRMAN: At the moment they do both.

MR. GOODE: All right, we are doing both; the C.B.C. budget is increasing and somewhere we are going to have to take the stand that this is all and we will have to cut into that budget one of these days,

it has to start coming down rather than go up.

MR. COYNE: I take it what you are suggesting is, commercial sponsorship is necessary for the operation of this thing in this country because it is the only way that sufficient funds could be made available; the taxpyers won't support the whole thing without commercial revenue? But would you carry it this far: For instance, if the Vancouver Symphony Orchestra was playing on a Friday evening and at the same time the fights were coming through from Madison Square Garden and no one was prepared to sponsor the Vancouver Symphony Orchestra, should they be kept off the air as a matter of principle?

MR. GOODE: I would not want to asnwer that. That is something a television man would have to decide, not a chap like myself. I would hope that the people of British Columbia could see the Symphony Orchestra. There is no doubt there are some programmes that will be to the cost of the people, but I hope keep those to a minimum; we are not keeping them to a minimum now and, as I say, we are very worried about this budget, and that is one of the reasons I am in Vancouver today.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is one of the reasons we are here too.

MR. COYNE: Turning to the next page where you are dealing with the matter of competition and you mention the limited facilities that are available to advertisers through the one channel, you say:

"I suggest to you that it is not fair

"competition that one firm selling one
"specific product has television avail-
"able to him while another selling a
"like product cannot receive the same
"treatment. I don't think this is free
"enterprise and, frankly, I don't think
"it is fair."

Now, when you say that, I imagine you mean because of the fact there is only one outlet; you are not suggesting because it is a Government outlet rather than a private one?

MR. GOODE: No, that was not in my mind.

THE CHAIRMAN: But if you have only one more channel here, one year or three years from now you are going to be back in the same place if the growth takes place that we expect in British Columbia.

MR. GOODE: I do not think the growth of British Columbia is limited to two television stations any more than we are limited to one public utility company. British Columbia is going ahead and in the years ahead we most likely will have five television stations, I hope so, if the business and population goes along in the way it is now.

THE CHAIRMAN: You realize there are technical problems at the moment in connection with anything like five television stations in this area?

MR. GOODE: Well, we have two here now -- I forget the one assigned to Chilliwack -- there are 2 and 8 now.

THE CHAIRMAN: 3 is assigned to Chilliwack.

MR. GOODE: Yes, I had forgotten.

MR. COYNE: That is, you would be including, say, three in Vancouver, one in Victoria and one in Chilliwack as being in this area, would you?

MR. GOODE: I would not want to say that. The channels have been assigned there and I think this Commission knows it will be a long time before Chilliwack can support a television station. As you know, the channels are limited to a distance, I think 250 miles, and we are limited to that, but I see the time when there are going to be further television channels than there are now on a different technical basis. That you gentlemen know about better than I do, and at that time the limitation on the lower mainland will not be three channels, there could be a lot more.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point I am putting to you, you say:

"I suggest to you that it is not fair com-
"petition that one firm selling one specific
"product has television available to him
"while another selling a like product can-
"not receive the same treatment."

My only question to you is, you add the second and only presently available channel and in the course of the growth of this area are you not going to be back immediately in the same position very shortly where it would be, in your view, unfair competition of one firm selling a specific product has television available to him while another selling a like product cannot receive the same treatment?

MR. GOODE: We have done our best to obviate such a position, we are forcing, at the time, the people to go to the United States, and they would not have to do that, they would at least have Canadian facilities available to them. I forget the number of sponsors on the waiting list early in 1955, but the picture in my mind is something like 74. Now, I may be wrong.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: That answers itself. You are going to have discrimination against some of those 74 because they cannot all get on the available channels that you have here so there is going to be some discrimination somewhere under present conditions.

MR. GOODE: At least they would provide this other stations. We have gone as far as we can to obviate a position that I think is most unfortunate. We have done our best.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Keddy of the C.B.C., can you give us anything on the existence of a list of sponsors in British Columbia?

MR. KEDDY: Yes. I would like first to recall the answer that the General Manager gave to you in Ottawa when he said there was not a waiting list for Canadian programmes; that situation applies here in British Columbia in the same way for live programmes, we have them for sale, we are negotiating with three prospective clients for live programme sponsorship. With regard to the second class of programme, film programmes, there are approximately six prospective sponsors waiting for Class A time,

as Mr. Goode has already mentioned to you; the hours of Class A are from 6.00 to 11.00 P.M. Monday through Saturday and from 5.00 P.M. to 11.00 P.M. on Sunday. There are six companies who are waiting for Class A time, but there are availabilities for these six companies in Class B or C times, and also certain Class A times between 6.00 and 6.30 but they do not suit these individuals.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are talking of film?

MR. KEDDY: Yes, not a live programme. Then, there is a third type of advertising for spots and flashes and there is a waiting list on one-minute spots, and all four of those want double A times, and I am informed that is between 7.30 and 10.30 Monday through Saturday. I think I mentioned to you in answer to a question previously in co-operation with the private stations we have worked out our sustaining programmes to, I think, 28 minutes, leaving availabilities before and after sustaining programmes of a public service nature. For programmes of this spot announcement nature there is no waiting list for twenty-second flash announcements.

MR. GOODE: I think the Commission should have before them any large advertising agency in British Columbia who would tell you an entirely different story. I respect the gentleman who has just spoken, he is an official of the C.B.C. and, as far as I know his information could be correct, but that gives a very false picture.

THE CHAIRMAN: We were just directing it

to the long waiting list of sponsors for the C.B.C.

MR. GOODE: I said that, I say there is a long waiting list of sponsors waiting for programmes on the C.B.C., and I am quite sure any advertising agency on the lower mainland would say so.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are happy to have any evidence that anyone wishes to put before us, Mr. Goode.

MR. COYNE: I suppose, on that point about the fairness of the situation, Mr. Goode, would you say that if that one channel could accommodate eight sponsors in an evening, that two channels could accommodate sixteen, and to that extent possibly you have reduced the unfairness; you have not eliminated it but you have reduced it?

MR. GOODE: We have done the best we can.

MR. COYNE: If you will turn to page 7 ---

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Could I interject a question there? This is on the basis of advertising; you made mention of the fact, and it has been brought to our attention both in Winnipeg and Regina, of the number of Canadian firms who go down to Bellingham to have their advertising flashed back to Canada; could you tell us the nature of the companies, the products they sell that are advertised in that way? The only reason I am asking the question is this, that there is a considerable amount of Canadian advertising comes back to us through the Buffalo stations in Toronto but it is of a class that is strictly prohibited by law in Canada; that is, liquor and beer

and one thing and another like that. Now, if you could give us some indication of whether or not they are articles of that nature that are being flashed back from Bellingham it would assist us.

MR. GOODE: Mr. Chairman, the class of Canadian sponsorship on the Bellingham station, in my opinion, and it is sometime since I looked at Bellingham -- in my opinion it is sponsors who would be welcomed by the C.B.C.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: In other words, the goods they sell are not of a nature prohibited by any Act of Provincial or Federal law?

MR. GOODE: It would be my opinion that would be true.

THE CHAIRMAN: The same situation Mr. Stewart speaks of is also present in Montreal where I live, but, again, the nearby American stations are only carrying advertising of a class which is not permitted in Canada.

MR. GOODE: That is not true in this case.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is what we want.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Goode, would you say perhaps one reason why Vancouver advertisers go to Bellingham to advertise rather than to the C.B.C., would it have any relationship to the size of audiences, the relative size of audiences which the two stations have in Vancouver? Have you any information on that?

MR. GOODE: I do not think the sponsors go to Bellingham rather than going to the C.B.C., it is

because they cannot get on C.B.C., that is the reason. I do not think there is one of those sponsors, in fact, I have been told by a number of them that they did not want to go over there but there is no way of advertising their products in Canada over television.

MR. COYNE: I wanted to go on to page 7 where you are referring to competition between C.B.C. and other broadcasters. Assuming that second stations were started in the larger metropolitan areas, do you believe that the C.B.C. should actively compete in the business sense with those private stations? We have been told -- I think this was in the radio field -- the C.B.C. takes national commercial advertising but leaves the local field to the local stations.

MR. GOODE: They must have all the advertising here because there is no other place that national advertisers or anyone else can advertise except on a United States station.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: I think one is talking radio and the other is talking television now.

MR. GOODE: Well, I was talking television.

MR. COYNE: The nature of my point was this: If a private television station were licensed in Vancouver, do you think that the C.B.C. should actively compete with that station for advertising revenue?

MR. GOODE: Certainly; oh yes, by all means. Just because it is a Government station is no reason why they should not go to work and get some

business to do in advertising in the C.B.C. I say this with all respect to the officials; people have to go to them, just because you are owned by the people of Canada there is no reason why you should not go to work and get business, and that is what I want them to do. It is too long that the Government agencies have waited for business to come to them; if there is some time left on C.B.C. of sponsored time, why should not the C.B.C. officials go out and get sponsors for it? Just because we own the network -- I cannot see it.

MR. COYNE: If there was a private station operating in Vancouver you would not think it unfair that this Government agency should go out and compete for advertising business?

MR. GOODE: I think it would be good business, let them fight amongst themselves to get the best sponsors they can. I am all for that.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am not sure those two phrases necessarily hang together, if they fight amongst themselves that they will necessarily get the best programmes. But you, I take it, would disagree with the present C.B.C. policy in radio of not competing for local advertising in local areas?

MR. GOODE: Certainly I would; I think the Government agency has to get all the income it can get, and if it has to take it away from private enterprise, let them do it.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Even though the Government agency is subsidized by public funds?

MR. GOODE: I think that is the reason the subsidy might be given; if the officials of the C.B.C. radio or television went out in competition with private business, I think in that way we can cut our subsidy.

MR. COYNE: Just turning now to your final remarks where you deal with the financing, you say:

"I want to comment on the suggestion made
"to this Commission --- "

MR. GOODE: What page are you on?

MR. COYNE: I beg your pardon, page 11.

"I want to comment on the suggestion made
"to this Commission by the Canadian Broad-
"casting Corporation that each individual
"set owner in Canada be charged a large
"license fee."

My recollection of the evidence is that there was no suggestion from the C.B.C., a specific suggestion that a license fee be charged; but I take it from what you say that you would be against the imposition of a license fee in television similar to what we used to have in radio?

MR. GOODE: Yes, I would.

MR. COYNE: And you would feel that the financial requirements of the C.B.C. should be provided instead out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund?

MR. GOODE: That is right, I do.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Probably it is not a fair question to ask a Member of the House, but you would favour the rescinding, then, of the present

15% excise tax which goes back to the C.B.C. as a means of furthering their financial requirements?

MR. GOODE: Yes, that is a fair question; yes, I would.

MR. COYNE: And you said that you had no particular representations as to changes in control, Government control, in the radio or television field; I believe you said that earlier?

MR. GOODE: I have very strong feelings on this matter which I thought that, in all fairness, I should keep out of my brief. After all, I must take into consideration that I am in political life, if I might say it that way; entirely outside of my brief, as I said to the Commission this morning, the control should be held in the field, and I am quite willing to leave it to the Commission to judge what kind of control.

THE CHAIRMAN: The principle of control by a public agency on radio and television is one that you subscribe to?

MR. GOODE: Yes, I have said certain things in the Committee in the House; I must not say those things in front of this Commission.

MR. COYNE: Would it be fair to say, Mr. Goode, that any subsidies you would have in mind for television is a system to what we have become used to in radio, that a Government body such as the C.B.C. producing national programmes with private stations existing in the larger metropolitan areas to provide for local needs?

MR. GOODE: I think you have stated it as I would have said it myself.

MR. COYNE: That is all.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have one or two questions I might ask you, because I know in your brief you want to be accurate, and I am only trying to make sure that any statement you make is not inaccurate. They both happen to relate to statements subscribed to the C.B.C., one on page 11 which Mr. Coyne was just speaking to you about is this: Where you are talking about a license you say:

> "I want to comment on the suggestion made
> "to this Commission by the Canadian Broad-
> "casting Corporation that each individual
> "television set owner in Canada be charged
> "a large license fee."

I think it is only fair to point out that the C.B.C. did not make such a suggestion to us. What they did say was, if it was done by a license fee and in certain circumstances the fee would have certain benefits, but they did not come out and support a license fee.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: They put it on the basis of getting the programmes to the homes and over the networks, they felt it would cost approximately $15 per television home but they were not suggesting a fee of that kind at all, they used it for financial statistical purposes only.

MR. GOODE: I am glad you brought that up, because the press in the East did not carry that at all.

THE CHAIRMAN: I know they did not, I think it is fair to bring that out.

MR. GOODE: I base it on the press reports.

THE CHAIRMAN: The other is on page 7 where you say the argument has been made before this Commission that the C.B.C. cannot survive if private competition is allowed in the television field. That was an argument that was not put forward by the C.B.C.; in fact, the reverse was put forward, they said they could survive, that they could run it as a commercial venture if that is what the people of Canada want, but they want to be able to provide the kind of national service they have been doing, which is quite a different thing to this statement.

MR. GOODE: I think I should qualify that, too. If the C.B.C. have made that statement before the Commission, then it is my impression they did not make the same statement before the Committee in the House of Commons.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think I have another question, and I think a man like you, experienced in public life, can give us some help on it. On page 4 of your brief you say:

"I suggest to you the C.B.C. is operating
"in a manner that fits the needs of a
"minority of our television viewers."

The reason for my question is, that one of the great things we are facing in this matter is the diversity of opinion on this very subject of fitting the needs of the minority of our television viewers.

This is the view you have expressed and we will hear a brief today or tomorrow from the British Columbia Federation of Labour which has over 50,000 trade unionists as members, and they say in that brief that the only relief from the heavily-commercialized programmes is our own C.B.C. Later on they say:

"The record of the Canadian Broadcasting
"Corporation, although not perfect, and
"subject to much constructive criticism,
"has been in the main to give well-rounded
"programmes recognizing the various groups
"that make up our Canadian population."

We have had similar statements from people who represent 60,000 farmers in the West and various educational groups who all spoke in favour of the type of programme the C.B.C. is supplying. I wish you would tell me how we can follow up these various and conflicting opinions that we have?

MR. GOODE: Personally, I would not want your job. I think I can help you there, it is a fair question and I will try to give you a fair answer. I have gone into this matter to find out what the people wanted, not what some political Party wanted or some union, with all respect, that might represent a political Party. If this Commission could have the opportunity of talking to the majority of the people in Canada they will know that what I have said in my brief, I think, is a fair comment on what people think. That is what I have tried to give you; I have tried not to give you figures or some things

that perhaps I could have said regarding Committees in the House where we have gone into the technicalities. I have tried to give you what I think the people are thinking, and that can be supported not by professional briefs from unions or, as I say, from political Parties, but just an honest opinion as to what Tom Jones on the corner of the street is thinking. What I have told you this morning, whether it is right or not, anything I say to this Commission is correct, it is sincerely correct as far as I know, but I am trying to give you the opinion of the man on the street, and whether I have or not will be for you to judge.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think you in your own brief at page 10 put your finger on the problem where you talk about private programme content, and that is an extremely difficult one to work out, as you understand.

MR. GOODE: I have tried to help you and not hinder you.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do want to thank you, and also Mr. Nichols, for coming today and particularly for coming so far to present this brief. We know you came from Ottawa for this purpose and we, of course, will consider it along with the other briefs we receive.

MR. GOODE: Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will adjourn for seven or eight minutes now.

---A short recess.

SUBMISSION OF UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA TELEVISION COMMITTEE.

APPEARANCES:

Dean G.C. Andrew

Dean A.W. Matthews

Dr. Marion B. Smith

Mr. Norman Barton

THE CHAIRMAN: We will now have a brief from the University of British Columbia Television Committee of which Dean Andrew is the Chairman; you have with you, Mr. Andrew ?

MR. ANDREW : Dr. Marion Smith, Dean Matthews, Mr. Norman Barton and Dr. Earle Birney.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will begin by marking your brief as Exhibit No. 68.

EXHIBIT NO. 68: Brief of University of British Columbia Television Committee.

MR. ANDREW : Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps the easiest way to do it would be to read it because it is an argument.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. ANDREW : Gentlemen, the Committee making representations to you at this time consists of members of the University of British Columbia who are interested in both radio and television from the following points of view:

As the means of communication most essential to the development and maintenance of Canada's national identity and

unity;

As instruments important to Canadian cultural development;

As a very important adjunct to our educational system, particularly in the field of adult education;

As most attractive forms of recreation.

The committee does not claim to represent the University of British Columbia officially, or any faculty or department of the University. Its membership has come together to study the implications of television in particular, and to provide a channel of communication between the radio and T.V. stations which want to make use of the University's resources for broadcasting and those members of the University who are interested and willing to broadcast if called upon.

Our study of radio and television has led us to concentrate our attention on the four areas outlined above and we wish to make some observations under each of the headings, together with some conclusions having to do with national broadcasting policy and finance.

The contribution of radio and T.V. to national identity and national unity: The history of Canada is in large part the story of the struggle to establish effective transportation and communication across what was long thought to be an area too inhospitable to be effectively occupied and humanly developed. Those who dreamed Sir John A. MacDonald's

dream of an ocean to ocean society were thought to be - as Professor Creighton's recent biography testifies - impractical visionaries. Many asked: "Why not embrace our fate and accept the inevitable: union within the United States?" There are still Canadians who feel this way, but it is our observation that they are relatively few. The vast majority of Canadians want to develop a society and a way of life distinctively their own, one which accepts the English-French traditions we have inherited, and which builds on them, modified by our North American environment.

To want to do this does not imply anti-Americanism, nor indeed any lack of appreciation of, or sympathy with, our United States neighbours. The fact is we are a political, social, economic and cultural entity, and although we share many aspirations and values with the U.S., we also differ from them in important respects. So long as the majority of us want to and can continue an independent existence we have an obligation to develop ourselves, and our resources, as fully and distinctively as we can.

To do this we need efficient transportation; road, rail and air, all of which we have got or are in the process of getting -- and all of which have been provided in greater or lesser degree by public subsidy -- in the interests of national identity and national unity.

What is true of transportation is also

true of communication, except that we have not protected the national interest as well in this field. The moving picture industry is a case in point. This industry in Canada still remains in overwhelming degree a distribution industry, organized to distribute the surplus product of the United States home market. Unlike, for example, the oil or lumber industry, it has not yet begun in any significant degree to domicile itself in Canada. Our newsreels to this day are edited for Canadian distribution in New York and as a consequence we see and hear mostly news prepared for Americans by Americans. "Our foreign policy" in our movie newsreels means American foreign policy. It is not anti-American to feel that this is hardly the way to develop an alert self-consciousness about our own international responsibilities. It is of course necessary to add that the reason the movie industry in Canada has developed as it has is simply because we have not yet developed a Canadian market large enough to support a native industry on a commercial basis alone. We are in the process of developing a native industry in this field but its growth is slow and will be slow as it has to make headway against the fully developed American industry. In the meantime we have our national identity to preserve and our national unity to foster. What has been said of the moving picture industry could be repeated about the publications industry -- as the recent budget recognized -- though the means of recognizing it has been challenged.

In general, the problems involved in ensuring that our communications industries are in a position to foster both national identity and national unity, are even more complex and difficult than they are in the fields of transportation, though they are difficult enough there.

It is apparent that in all the communications fields, newspapers, magazines, moving pictures, radio and T.V., the lack of a large Canadian market has resulted in slowing down the rate at which private business enterprise has been able to contribute to the growth of our national self-consciousness. In addition, the presence of fully matured industries in these fields just south of the Border which can in effect market the surplus product of their domestic circulation very cheaply in Canada, has further handicapped Canadian private enterprise in doing the job that our present position in the world makes imperative.

It is encouraging to see that some Canadian magazines are making some headway against these obstacles, and in the case of Maclean's Magazine particularly producing an excellent publication about Canada for Canadians. It is also encouraging to see that many of our metropolitan newspapers are improving their Canadian and foreign coverage. It is also encouraging to note the growth of our infant motion picture industry, and the development of some of our publishing houses. But if we are encouraged by the fact that private enterprise is

making headway in some of the communications industries, we are also impressed by the fact that the progress is slow in a world in which change is fast, and in which Canada has assumed world-wide obligations. Canadians can and will only respond to their obligations if they are kept fully informed about what those obligations are by people who are reasonably conversant with them.

The question now arises: in what ways do radio and television differ from the other forms of communication and what, if anything, justifies public control in these fields if the others are left to private enterprise.

The Aird Report made clear that limitation in number of available wave lengths was the factor making necessary public regulation and control. The limited and spreadout Canadian market, and the danger of being swamped by American programmes were the factors which dictated the kind of public authority exercising the control.

The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation became the regulating body, the policy forming body and the national programme producing body, and private enterprise was confined to local stations. The Canadian Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters for some years has been advocating a change in the existing set-up. In particular it would appear they want an "independent" regulatory body established which would arbitrate as between the independent stations and their "competitors" the

C.B.C. They also want permission to form limited "networks" at will. It would not appear that they want to form a national television network, nor do they seem to want a national radio network.

Before evaluating the claims of the CARTB it is worth recalling what the present system is supposed to be and do. The first thing that it is important to note is that there are at the present time no competing national networks, and so far as we have been able to discover, no demand for competing national networks, either in television or radio. One national system of networks, French and English, is all -- apparently -- the Canadian economy can justify -- at the present time. That system was established and is maintained as a complementary, rather than a competitive, system; one in which the C.B.C. makes use of its own and private stations to secure complete national coverage.

We can easily see that private stations regard themselves as being in competition with local C.B.C. stations in individual localities, even though the competition there is limited as the C.B.C. does not attempt to compete locally on radio for commercial advertising. But we cannot see how the CARTB is in competition nationally, nor are we convinced that the economy could afford two competing national systems, if both of them undertook to foster Canadian national identity and further Canadian unity by their programming. We are supported in this view by the attitude of the CARTB themselves,

if we are fully informed about their attitude. They would like, we understand, to have the opportunity to form regional or ad hoc networks. If they receive this opportunity it is important to know both whether this will increase the cost to the Canadian taxpayer of maintaining our national networks, and whether their network programming will include a percentage of Canadian originated programmes using Canadian talent equal to that of the national networks.

Here again we are caught between the desirability of maintaining and developing Canadian national identity, and encouraging the free play of business enterprise where that can be profitable -- and responsible.

In short, radio and television differ from the other communications industries by virtue of the air wave limitation factor, and as a consequence some measure of public control in these fields is inevitable. The main question then would appear to be: What kind of public control? Are any changes in the existing set-up desirable?

As a general principle we favour competition in the world of communications and in the world of ideas, as it usually makes for a wider variety of views and opinions to select from, and renders more difficult the inculcation of a single point of view. However, it seems to us apparent that there is not at the present time a Canadian market large enough to justify two national competing systems, one private, one public. We are further

driven to the conclusion that a private system in order to be profitable would necessarily become in large measure a distribution system for the surplus product of the American market. If the maintenance and development of our national identity and national unity are as important as we think they are, then a high percentage of Canadian originated programming is essential, and there is not at the present time a sufficient Canadian market to warrant a high percentage of Canadian programming on a commercial basis alone. A public subsidy is necessary for this purpose.

We would therefore conclude that one system of publicly-controlled broadcasting and television ought to be maintained, and ought to be supported by public subsidy, to the extent that the national interest demands, and that this ought to be perpetuated until such time as a Canadian domestic market will support both a public and a private system, with both of them feeling responsible for originating at least 50% of Canadian-originated material. We do not see this development in the immediate future.

In the meantime, as competition does not seem feasible in the national network area, we favour as much competitition as possible through the local outlets, provided always that that competition does not mean that the national network stations originate only educational and cultural material, and the private outlet stations originate only recreational and entertainment material. Both forms of local outlet should carry some measure of the

local public responsibility, and the national governing body should set and maintain standards for all local outlets to adhere to.

In our opinion therefore a single Board of Governors of Canadian Radio and Television Broadcasting should be maintained on its present basis of regional representation, and for most, if not all, of its present purposes. The single change we would suggest considering is that the present Board of Governors at the C.B.C. might be tied less closely to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation operationally, this for the purpose of making it more apparent, than it currently is, that the Board of Governors is in a position to ensure that standards in broadcasting and television are maintained both by the national system and by the private outlets. We do not think that the Board of Governors as they currently exist have lacked impartiality, but they have been put in the position of appearing to be the spokesmen and defenders of the national public system in their dealings with the independent stations, and for this reason their full effectiveness may have been in some degree inhibited.

We confess that we are not sure whether a semi-separation of the Board of Governors from the operational side of the national system would weakan or strengthen their relationship to the national system, and we would not wish to prejudice their effectiveness in relationship to that system, but if some separation can be achieved without

weakening their effectiveness in that relationship, we think it would be desirable.

All of the arguments so far advanced arise, naturally we feel, out of a concern for the preservation and development of our national identity and national unity, and this is in our opinion of prime importance to all Canadians at this point in our development.

As instruments important to Canadian cultural development: Radio and television are, we feel, potentially the most effective means of keeping the whole Canadian family acquainted with one another and related to one another. The press is also very important but we have no national newspaper, and our local newspapers for the most part perform essential community or regional, rather than national, functions. It is a commonplace to observe that British Columbians seldom find adequate news about B.C. in the newspapers of the Maritime Provinces, and that Maritimers feel themselves inadequately informed about home affairs while reading, for example, Prairie newspapers. The national news bulletins of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation are national, as are many other of their programmes, and television provides an excellent opportunity to keep Canadians in all parts of the country visually informed about their national development. But to develop the potential of these media we need many more Canadians associated with these industries, who are well-informed about Canada as a whole, and we further need

opportunities for Canadians who have creative and artistic talent to illustrate the particular characteristics of Canadian creativity throughout Canada. Our national culture, even if not highly developed as yet, is a distinctive culture, and it embraces everything from hockey and lacrosse to the Group of Seven and Andrew Allan's radio drama. It further embraces everything from the Ballads of Newfoundland to the Salmon Derbies of the Pacific Coast. It is furthermore composed both of English-speaking and French-speaking traditions, with important other ethnic components.

We need to develop national figures who illustrate national interests and national characteristics. Foster Hewitt, Barbara Ann Scott, "Rocket" Richard, are all important in developing the Canadian concept of Canadian culture. So also are Lawren Harris, Lister Sinclair, Earle Birney, Sir Ernest MacMillan. So also are the growing number of symphony orchestras which are currently struggling for an existence in Canadian cities. So also are our national and local art galleries. So also are our theatre groups, our educational institutions. So also are our achievements in the field of industry and commerce. So also, for example, is the vision shown by the Canadian Pacific Airlines in extending Canada's name throughout Asia.

These are all things that should be projected on our national networks in order that Canadians may see something of the sum of their

accomplishments, and develop a proper appreciation of what they are capable of doing and have done. To project these all costs money, but even more, it requires increasing numbers of talented and creative persons trained to do this work through the media of radio and television. We have to make it possible for young creative people to see their future in Canada by providing more, and more regular, employment for their talents. The development of Canadian culture is not the perquisite of a few. It should embrace the whole way of life of the Canadian people, and should offer something for everyone in the country. There has been a tendency to associate culture with the minority and to try and define culture in terms which do not embrace Canadian hockey and the international competition of the University of British Columbia rowing team racing at Henley. To concentrate on culture as including music, art and drama, but omitting the accomplishments of industry, the settlement of the north, or sports and recreation, would indeed mean that a projection of Canadian culture was a service to a minority by a minority, and there might therefore be some objection to spending everyone's tax dollar to the support of such a programme. Inadequate resources, up to the present time, have resulted in an inadequate presentation of the total Canadian way of life and this we would like to see remedied, both for the preservation of our national identity and the realization of our way of life.

Adult education through radio and television: It is accepted that we are living in an age of technological revolution and that it is of the utmost importance that people at all levels of industry should be kept aware of the implications of the technological revolution on their particular job and form of employment. Industries themselves are much concerned to ensure that their employees, their foremen, their executives, should be educated on the job to the implications of this technological change.

Further, the social implications of technological change, particularly in the fields of communications and transportation, mean that it has become increasingly important that citizens of all sorts have available to them the means and facilities to adjust to social changes technology has brought about.

Further still, technology has made available increased amounts of leisure time and there is a need and an appetite to find out how best to use the leisure time.

For all these reasons radio and television have become essential media to meet the demand for vocational adult education and for education in the fields of citizenship and recreation. This does not, of course, mean that the media should be used exclusively for these purposes, but that a balanced ration of programming, which includes entertainment, public affairs, the projection of the Canadian way of life, should also include such adult education ventures as Farm Forum and the Citizens' Forum extended to include,

for example, a Fishermen's Forum, Lumbermen's Forum, and more emphasis on vocational, cultural and recreational activities in terms of the particular and peculiar opportunities offered in Canada.

Radio and television as recreation: In a recent article in Maclean's Magazine the point was made by a series of panelists, all of them connected with radio and television, that there is too much tendency in Canada to accept American standards of T.V. production as being the norm for Canadians to aim at. Some of these panelists pointed to what seems to us to be patent truth, that Canadian production is not likely to have as much money available to it as American production has, and that therefore we should be seeking ways and means to present our entertainment in ways other than copying American standards. This seems to us important, both from a financial and from an entertainment point of view. As users of Canadian television we are impressed with the amounts of money and the technical skill which some American programmes lavish on light forms of entertainment, and which we cannot afford to duplicate. It therefore becomes important to develop some entertainment forms that are less expensive but still first-class entertainment. We do not of course imply that we should not import American entertainment, but we do feel that we should not depend on American entertainment alone but should make an effort to develop some originality in this area.

Recommendations:

1. We recommend that one national system of radio and television be maintained under one publicly-appointed Board of Governors of Canadian Radio and Television Broadcasting, and that this publicly-appointed Board be representative of the various regions and social interests of Canadians. We would like to commend the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and the existing Board of Governors for both their concept of their responsibility and the way they have carried it out.

2. We recommend that to the fullest extent possible in terms of wave lengths available, private local outlets be encouraged, and that they be encouraged to assume some measure of responsibility locally and regionally. We would like to commend the measure of public responsibility already assumed by many local private stations.

3. We recommend that the present policy of one television station per city be kept under review, with the object in mind that competing stations be allowed, provided always that they undertake to originate some Canadian programming and do not merely rely on importing the inexpensive surplus of the American domestic market.

4. We further recommend that funds adequate to ensure an adequate projection of Canadian ways of life and Canadian accomplishments be made available to the National System and that these funds be provided by the Parliement of Canada.

5. We further recommend that funds of

sufficient amount be provided in order to ensure that the national system does not have to depend on commercial sponsorship for more than one-third or a maximum of one-half of its programming. We would point out that if commercial-sponsored programming can be kept to one-third on the national system, the sooner the day will come when the Canadian market alone can support a fuller measure of competition between private and publicly-sponsored stations, and that seems to us a desirable objective, so long as the national interest is protected.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dean Andrew. I know that you in the University have certain activities going on today which are rather pressing, and I would like to know what would be the most convenient way to proceed from here. Has Dean Matthews or any others of your group anything to add at this stage?

MR. ANDREW : Dean Matthews, who is Chairman of our Athletic Committee at the University and also very active in Canadian Intercollegiate Athletics has some remarks he would like to make supplementary on the specific subject of amateur athletics being part of the cultural pattern of Canada.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we will hear you now, and if you need to go before we are quite finished with this submission, I hope you will not fail to do so.

MR. MATTHEWS: May I submit to you that the reference in the University of British Columbia

brief to the desirability of maintaining a high proportion of Canadian programming, in the interests of our national identity and national unity, should be applied equally to athletics as to drama, music and moving pictures, and other forms of entertainment. While not wishing to belittle professional sport in this same connection, it is contended that a high calibre of amateur sport, as represented by Intercollegiate competition, could be a most important influence in the development of national pride and unity.

Intercollegiate competition has developed well in Ontario and Quebec, where the universities are, at the most, an overnight train journey apart. In Western Canada progress has been much slower and the problem of regular competition is a difficult one. In the 1920's and early '30's, the four Western universities did attempt to carry on an active programme but it eventually foundered on two main obstacles -- the length of time the students had to absent themselves from classes while on trips and the expense of the long rail journeys. U.B.C. and Manitoba began to look south of the Border for competition. British Columbia still carries on a programme of sports with Washington colleges in the Evergreen Conference. However, now that air travel has brought the four Western universities into the same time relationship as those in the Eastern Intercollegiate Union, active planning is underway with the objective of re-establishing competition in the main spectator sports--

basketball, football and hockey.

The possibility of the C.B.C. using some of these games as sustaining programmes and of providing a subsidy which could be applied against air travel could be a tremendously important factor at the present stage of development of Western intercollegiate competition. Many T.V. sets are tuned in each week on boxing, wrestling, football and basketball of American origin. Names of United States universities and their basketball and football teams have become well-known in Canadian homes. It is reasonable to presume that Canadian viewers would welcome a liberal programming of Canadian university games, where the calibre of play, even though not as highly publicized as in the United States, is nonetheless very high.

It is contended, also, that at the present stage of Canada's development there should be regular Canadian finals in intercollegiate sport just as there are in other branches of sport and in drama, music, etc. Possibly few things offer the same possibility for the development of Canadian university unity. Regular East-West finals in basketball, football and hockey could become possible immediately if T.V. subsidization were to make air travel available to the teams. It should not be overlooked, in this connection, that another Government agency, T.C.A., would be a beneficiary. There is little doubt that the Canadian public would welcome an opportunity to view such play-offs.

We believe a high calibre of intercollegiate athletics will provide a strong incentive for

the development of high school sport and provide an outlet for many players who are not attracted to professional sport. At the same time college teams are well recognized as a proving ground for the players needed by professional clubs. Successful spectator sports in any university provide revenue with which minor sports such as rowing, swimming, track and field, etc., are developed. Thus the whole system benefits.

I might say we are particularly conscious of this problem here in British Columbia because of our rowing at the present time. I think we have a very strong point in the showing made by the crew both at the British Empire Games and at Henley last year. They did quite an appreciable amount to stimulate the opinion of the ability of the Canadians in sports. Perhaps we might even say that the Olympic Committee and perhaps the C.B.C. and other agencies are somewhat remiss in that more is not being done for the olympic year to make it possible for all sorts of top athletes to compete in the trials rather than at such a terrific expense to the sponsors of the teams, such as in our case with the crew.

To sum up, it is contended that strong intercollegiate competition in major sports, both East and West, with annual national play-offs would do much to draw Canadian universities closer together and to develop top Canadian athletes in these and other sports.

T.V. subsidization of these sports could

mean the difference between air travel and slower means of travel, a factor essential to a successful programme. Generous patronage by C.B.C. in the early stages would help to build an interesting sustaining medium, and, if one can assume a parallel with the United States, subsequently a quite saleable commodity.

The same significance should be attached to Canadian programming in the field of athletics as in drama, music, films, etc. It is contended that the viewing public would welcome an opportunity to see intersectional university games on T.V.

It is more reasonable that financial aid should be provided through C.B.C., which in turn receives programming features, than through reduced travel rates from T.C.A. or the railways.

All of which is respectfully submitted,

I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity of adding this supplement to the brief.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have one question, Dean Matthews, on your immediate point which I may ask now rather than wait until the questions. You make the point that amateur athletics, particularly of an inter-regional sort, are an element in Canadian culture and that the public, you, I think said, was quite anxious to view such games and you thought there would be a good response from the public. I am not quite clear as to why, if those facts exist, this popular demand, you feel you would have to wait for this to be a saleable commodity; why wouldn't it be possible, or are there any technical reasons why it is

not possible to have commercial sponsorship of such programmes right away?

MR. MATTHEWS: Mr. Chairman, I believe there has been some commercial sponsorship of athletic events, and I believe I am correct in saying that has not been true of this area. Our experience with the attempts we have made to have some of our university sports televized would tend to convince me, at least, that at the present time the time is not available except perhaps at a time of day when a sponsor may not be interested, and furthermore that any evidence we have had of desire to sponsor the programmes needs considerable build-up before it would justify the televizing of the game from the point of view that our experience has not yet enabled us to determine what we are going to do with the gate receipts at a game that is televized locally. In other words, the point of subsidy is still there for some time to come.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is no objection from the university point of view or the amateur status point of view of the players having commercial sponsorship of such broadcasts?

MR. MATTHEWS: With some qualifications on who the sponsor would be.

MR. ANDREW : I would go a little further than that and say we are having a hard time to retain amateur sport on an amateur basis, and commercial sponsorship does make it a little more difficult particularly in some fields. Recently, in the newspapers, we have had an illustration of some of the

difficulties of commercial sponsorship in cultural activities.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: I would like to ask Dean Matthews one question, and it is a question I have thought of asking at different places. There is apparently a lack of sponsorship for certain programmes: Do you think the Canadian people have an inferiority complex or is it a question of far away fields looking greener, because there are quite a number of good programmes that apparently lack commercial sponsorship? It is just an academic question but I would like to get an answer -- whether we as Canadians have an inferiority complex to the extent that only good plays can come from New York and Hollywood and only good athletics can come from Southern California?

MR. ANDREW : I think apparently our minds are in a bit of a groove on this, and this is why I thought that this particular approach, the athletic approach, may be a somewhat fresh one. Because I do think that those who might sponsor these things -- and I think in this case the C.B.C. and certainly the Olympic Committee of Canada has been particularly remiss in not trying to see to it that amateur sports have been fostered with the widest possible amateur competition that is available. I think they are thinking in terms of American communications and have not let their imaginations play on the particular possibilities in Canada.

MR. MATTHEWS: I would say in answer to Mr. Stewart's question too, Mr. Chairman, that I

believe there is something of an inferiority complex you mentioned, but I think we are in the process of dissipating that very quickly and that events we have had such as our success in rowing and many others I could name are bringing us a long way along the road in that regard, and that is why I think a particular boost at this time which television may be able to give may be much more use than at a time when we are in far better shape.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: The question arose in my mind as you were talking, and on other occasions it has arisen on other questions such as drama, but you were talking about sports, and the only two sports I can think of that are telecast are purely Canadian --professional hockey and the Dominion curling championship, and as far as I recall those are the only two -- oh, Canadian football, too, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have some hope that this attitude may be breaking down at the moment?

MR. MATTHEWS: I think definitely.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Coyne?

MR. COYNE: Turning, if you will, to page 4, you say:

"It is apparent that in all the communica-
"tions fields, newspapers,magazines, moving
"pictures, radio and T.V., the lack of
"a large Canadian market has resulted in
"slowing down the rate at which private
"business enterprise has been able to con-
"tribute to the growth of our national

"self-consciousness."

I would like to ask you this; do you feel it is only the economy which you mentioned -- that is, the lack of a large Canadian market -- which has prevented private enterprise from contributing materially to the growth of our national self-consciousness in this field?

MR. ANDREW : I think it is basically that. If you consult newspaper publishers about why they have not got correspondents in the areas of the world in which Canadians are selling goods, they will say, "We cannot afford it. We would like to", besides which they also add at that point, "We are doubtful about the public reading interest", but the basic and first thing they always say is, "We cannot afford it". We have got interests all over the world and we are selling, to be perfectly specific about it, we are selling over ten times as much in Japan than we are buying in Japan, and there is no Canadian newspaper or correspondent in Japan reporting on the tastes of Japan for the Canadian product. I could go through the other communications. I think actually the people in private business are, as they see it, just as interested in Canadian national unity and identity as anybody else. I am not in a position to judge whether their rate of profit would in the national interest -- could in the national interest be cut into a little in order to afford these other things, because that is their business; but I have every reason to believe in their patriotism, and I think basically the problem is economy.

MR. COYNE: So it would follow from that that if we had a sufficiently large market, if we were as well off in that respect as the United States, say, then private enterprise would have done the job?

MR. ANDREW : No, not entirely, because I left the second characteristic there, the second point, and that is this; that a business enterprise does exist, as Mr. Goode was observing, for profit, and a person is entitled to take his profit, and if he can have a profit by importing everything he can from the United States, it requires an awful lot of public responsibility to reduce his profit voluntarily in order that the national consciousness shall be fostered. That is a pretty large and vague thing, and I was very much interested in the preceeding brief this morning which was based on the local side. I think all of us can get so immersed in local affairs that we forget the rest of the Canadian picture, and I think that we cannot afford to neglect that except on the charity of our national identity.

MR. COYNE: Then, would you say there is more justification for public subsidy of radio and T.V. services through the C.B.C. than the merely economic limitation that you spoke of in this paragraph you were referring to?

MR. ANDREW : The economic factor makes the other limitations, the public control, highly desirable because people are pulled in the direction of their economic self-interests.

MR. COYNE: Supposing we were as well off

in this country as the United States; would you still say that there would be some justification for a public agency such as the C.B.C.?

MR. ANDREW : Oh, yes.

MR. COYNE: Actively promoting those other aims in the radio and T.V. field?

MR. ANDREW : Sure.

MR. COYNE: You would not be satisfied with the present United States system even if it was commercially feasible in this country?

MR. ANDREW : Well, the Federal Communications Commission has not inspired me with any confidence, and people who have served on the Communications Commission have gone on to serve private interests after that, and I think you need as large and representative a body as you can for radio and television communications.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would like to come to that in a moment, but I think the point Mr. Coyne is on on page 4 is the question as to whether the implication or suggestion in this sentence, which I certainly got and apparently Mr. Coyne did, is that it is just the fact that we haven't had a big enough Canadian market which has prevented private enterprise making its contribution? It may not be quite right. In other words, may it not be that there are non-economic factors at work here as well as economic?

MR. ANDREW : Certainly, the projection of the national interest is at work here and I put it

on that basis simply because I don't think the strictly economic interest will ever entirely serve the national interest.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Andrew, will you tell us why you distinguish between radio and T.V. on the one hand and the other communication media, such as newspapers, magazines and motion pictures, on the other? In other words, why is it necessary or desirable through a public agency to foster this national consciousness development in radio and T.V. but not through the printed press, the moving picture and the other important media of communication?

MR. ANDREW: I could answer that in two ways; it is sometimes forgotten that the Canadian Press got a public subsidy for a considerable period when it was organizing itself. It discontinued that subsidy at a point at which it could afford to discontinue. I don't think at that time we knew very much nationally about how to control public money, and that is one of the factors in the C.P. revenue. I think we know more about how to control the use of public money without involving political abuse. I would hope that someone would provide the money for Canada to receive its news of the world from some source or from a variety of sources rather than from the C.P., through the A.P. only, because they prepare their news around the world for Americans by Americans, and then it is just rewritten in New York, and I don't think this is an adequate presentation of our national point of view. However, you are not

having a Royal Commission on that at the moment so I am not going to make any further observations on that subject. I don't think we are getting adequate presentation of Canadian interests in the other industries, but we are confined to this one, and on this particular one there is no situation existing that will permit of complete private enterprise. I think you said that there were not likely to be five channels available in Vancouver for a long time until there were technological changes. This immediately makes it different from the newspaper field and different from the publications field where, providing you have the money, you are at liberty to set up competing agencies.

MR. COYNE: Doesn't your qualification raise an important consideration, because you might just as well say that it is going to be a very long time before you are likely to have five daily newspapers in Vancouver? It is very true to say that anyone, provided he has the money, can set up a printing press, but, as a practical matter it is hardly true to say that you or I, if we want to present our point of view, are in a position to found a daily newspaper.

MR. ANDREW: Well, if you are inviting me to expatiate me on how we could get better Canadian coverage and how we could develop a sense of Canadian national entity through two other publication industries, that would take me a long way afield. I am not content -- let me put it as mildly as that -- that the other communications indus-

tries are doing a job for Canada and, as you are holding hearings on this one, I am anxious that it shall do a job for Canada.

MR. COYNE: You are not, really, then drawn to the sort of distinction that I suggested between these various media?

THE CHAIRMAN: You are merely dealing with the present one?

MR. ANDREW: That is right.

MR. COYNE: They might all, if we were concerned, be subject to some type of public subsidization or system, or equivalent to that in the radio and television field?

MR. ANDREW: Well, I am concerned with the projection of Canada, and I am not concerned so much with private enterprise or public enterprise, and I am trying to stick to that brief because as far as it can possibly be applicable I believe in private enterprise, but I believe even more in the realization of our national identity.

MR. COYNE: Turning to page 6, in the middle of the page -- and it turns up quite frequently in your brief -- "but we cannot see how the CARTB is in competition nationally, nor are we convinced that the economy could afford two competing systems, if both of them undertook to foster Canadian national identity and further Canadian unity by their programming." One of the objections that I think has been raised before us, one of the representations that has been made, is why should the broadcasting

industry be subject to controls and regulations requiring them to perform these certain services when people who are operating in other fields of media of communication are not subject to similar types of control?

MR. ANDREW: Well, I go back there to the fact of the limitation of air waves at the time of the Aird Commission, and the fact that in television we have not yet solved these particular problems that would make for free competition, and plus the fact that, again, I want to see the projection of the national way of life developed as fully as possible. I have not received any evidence that the private stations feel that they could do both things -- both run a national network and project the Canadian way of life, and make an honest dollar.

(Page 1616 follows)

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us assume, apart from the technicalities of the station, the wave length, availabilities, as far as you -- suppose you had a technical possibility of a private national system in Canada, would you go along with Mr. Goode earlier this morning in the belief that even the private case -- there was a case for control over the private system by the public?

MR. ANDREW: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: You would not subscribe to the view that if you have your national coverage existing through the national system and there are technical possibilities of having private stations, outside of that, that they should be left outside of it?

MR. ANDREW: Yes, I think a lot of this, the point Mr. Coyne and you are getting at, a lot depends on tradition. As you know, the College of Physicians and Surgeons is not a Government agency but it regulates and has regulated with great conscientiousness the ethics of the profession. There are those people who think it should be a Government agency as it is in the United States. We are more private enterprise in this field than they are. The same with the legal profession; because of their age and tradition they have maintained their self-governing bodies and protected the public interest reasonably well enough to avoid tangling with the public interest, but obviously now, if we are dealing with a profession that had an ancient tradition it is to me conceivable that the same circumstances

would apply and the financial interest involved in it would forbid it developing that way at the present time. Therefore, I want public control.

MR. COYNE: Well, you would say too, in effect, I gather, and you will correct me if I am wrong, that radio and television are vehicles through which the protection of national consciousness is possible and they should, therefore, be publicly-controlled and it would be no answer to you to say that the motion picture exhibitors are not controlled?

MR. ANDREW: Oh, no.

MR. COYNE: When you speak on page 8, towards the bottom, of the single change that you suggest, that the present Board of Governors might be tied less closely to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation operationally, are you suggesting that that would have any beneficial results in terms of operations, or are you thinking of it more in terms of the public relations aspect of the C.B.C.?

MR. ANDREW: I am thinking in terms, making it more clear, that this really emerges from the old principle that it is not enough that justice shall be done but you must also see to it that justice shall appear to be done. I think if Mr. Dunton had an office in another building or Mr. Bushnell or Mr. Ouimet had to walk across the street to him it would represent the fact more because also the members of the CARTB would have to walk across the street to him too and receive their interpretations of the Board's rulings. I do not think the Board at the

present time gets into programming matters at all; I think, in fact, it is a policy board but it is represented as being related operationally to the operations of the C.B.C. because Mr. Dunton's office is next door to Mr. Bushnell's, so to speak, and I think there is something to be said for making it apparent this control is separated. Furthermore, I think the operational control of the C.B.C. should be vested in the Headquarters staff and the regional representatives -- I never get a chance to criticize C.B.C., I am usually too busy trying to defend it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have one question on the Board of Governors: How do we get away from the problem of having, as you suggest, a fairly wide representation of different areas and different interests in Canada -- I do not mean business interests, I mean different points of view -- and also the practical problem of a part-time Board having to travel enormous distances in order to get into contact and are forced by circumstances into only being able to do it a few times a year?

MR. ANDREW: I do not think you can get away from that, you have to have a big enough staff; Mr. Dunton would have to have a big enough staff so he would have available to him the research resources to enable the Board to do its job, research resources so he knows exactly what the private stations are doing and what the C.B.C. is doing. I think we have to pay for that if we want this kind of thing, and then you could use part-time people. I do not think

the analogy with the Railway Board is good because I do not think the Commission has available to it nearly the resources of the C.P.R. or the C.N.R. I do not think they are as well-informed as either railway, that is why I would like to see the other.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you not take it a step further than that: that a small Commission like the Board of Transport Commissioners living, presumably, in Ottawa, would very quickly lose contact with the very thing you want the C.B.C. Board to do?

MR. ANDREW: That is right, that is entirely my point.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you admit that there is this problem of the part-time Board to give effective direction to a very complicated and demanding operation such as this?

MR. ANDREW: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Turning to your recommendations, Mr. Andrew, on page 14, No. 2, you say:

"We recommend that to the fullest extent
"possible in terms of wave length avail-
"able, private local outlets be encouraged--"

I just want to ask you whether that is precisely what you mean, because further down you suggest that there should also be an undertaking on the part of the private stations to originate some Canadian programming and perhaps there should be other conditions attached to the operation of private television licenses; you do not mean really that the only consideration should be the number of wave lengths available?

MR. ANDREW: Otherwise I would not have added that other clause. These two clauses should not be taken separately, I want to encourage as much competition and as many private stations as possible. I would like to put this in at this point: To me the matter of how much you can afford competition here depends on how much the people are willing to pay for it. I would like to make this parallel at the present time, I have not been able to get the exact figures on what we are still subsidizing railways, we subsidize them specifically for the barren haul north of Lake Superior.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: I think that was taken off.

MR. ANDREW: No, it has just been put on recently.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: About 120 miles there.

MR. ANDREW: The Maritime Freight Rates Act also provides for a very handsome subsidy in the national interest and the Newfoundland railways have since added to that subsidy. Now, to my mind, I have not been able to find out how much it comes to but I should not imagine it comes to less than the C.B.C. are now getting, somewhere between $35 million and $50 million, and I do not think that is a damn bit too much to pay for the realization of our national identity. I am not a constituent of Mr. Goode's, but I would talk to him about that anyway because I think we have to pay for what we want, and if we want the projection of Canada on our

communication industries or the unity of Canada through transportation we are going to have to pay the shot and $35 million is not much for this purpose. Now, coming directly to your point, if we have to pay $35 million or $40 million for the one system, I am prepared to pay $40 million or $45 million for one system. I value competition. Does that make my point?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think very clearly, and I think in those terms it is a new point to us. What you are saying in effect is, to have the value of competition at work in this field and then, if it costs a little more, it is worth it.

MR. ANDREW: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: That raises one question I had earlier where you draw this interesting comparison between the transportation needs of this country and the communications needs, and undoubtedly the analogy is fairly close, but do you see it has, or, do you think that there are some problems in the communications field arising from State intervention and control which are not as great or as important in the transportation field?

MR. ANDREW: Oh, sure, I said that specifically, I think; great as the difficulties are in transportation, communications are greater because you are dealing with opinion and you must try at all costs to avoid anyone having a monopoly. That is why I press for as much competition as possible.

THE CHAIRMAN: You said at one stage in

answer to a question that you felt we knew more today about how to give subsidies without getting political interventions; would you care to expand on that?

MR. ANDREW: Well, for instance, the Crown corporation is a fairly recent development -- I should explain this to you, a lawyer -- I do not know much about the law but I do know now that if you have public bodies receiving public subsidies, a sufficiently wide and varied advisory group, you have got a good buffer between direct political interference and the operations of the public, subsidized body. Furthermore, I think that the degree of ethics that the public expects from politics is important. Some politicians are a little more senstivie to the ethical implications than they were and they are likely to be removed by virtue of unethical actions quicker than they were some time ago. I think there are technical legal ways of creating buffers between political interference and publicly-owned corporation activities that we in political science terms did not know about 50 years ago.

THE CHAIRMAN: But is there not danger from this? I am only suggesting it because it has been said to us or I have read it somewhere, that you might pull yourself over to another difficulty. You use the notion of public corporations which obviously has created some barriers at least against the political control and intervention, but the analogy that the private corporation sometimes brings down as to who are your shareholders, how do

you bring public opinion to bear on the operation of a Crown corporation?

MR. ANDREW: Well, let me illustrate that. I do not know, you will be able to examine this at much closer quarters than I can, but the Religious Advisory Committee Board and the C.B.C. seems to me to be a fair assurance and I understand it operates very well in order to insure that the views, the wide range of religious views is available to the public on the C.B.C., and such bodies as these make sure that they reflect the shareholders, so to speak, as opposed to political interference.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Would it not seem to you that in the framing of this Act originally the Government had this very point in mind, that the C.B.C. has to report to Parliament rather than through the Cabinet?

MR. ANDREW: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I can see how the public view on a subject such as religion would be supplied by the Religious Advisory Committee, probably the public view of the Maritimes could be supplied by a Maritime Committee to some extent. How do you get the shareholders' interest in efficiency and economy reflected?

MR. ANDREW: This is a difficult one, there is inherent in the public corporation, I think, a tendency not to be as zealous about costs as in some private enterprises, though, on the other hand, private enterprises are becoming bureaucratic too.

Perhaps you can explain that to me?

THE CHAIRMAN: I will leave that to Mr. Stewart. Well, I raised it only because I thought you might have comments on it and it is a real problem.

MR. ANDREW: Yes, it is a problem.

MR. COYNE: I have just one final question and it is your final recommendation where you say:

"We would point out that if commercially-
"sponsored programming can be kept to one-
"third on the national system, the sooner
"the day will come when the Canadian market
"alone can support a fuller measure of com-
"petition between private and publicly-
"sponsored stations -- "

I just wanted to ask you whether you had in mind the fact the C.B.C. carrying the amount of advertising that it would accept, then the advertising, the surplus advertising would inevitably go over to the private stations and tend to build up their structure?

MR. ANDREW: Yes, but they cannot do that until we get assurance from the Parliament of Canada that the difference between $35 million and $45 million a year, that they have that in hand because they have to produce this and they have an awful lot of zealous watchdogs, some of them groups and some of them privately-appointed who will note any deterioration of the service, so that it seems to me that it is a matter of the Parliament of Canada ensuring that the funds adequate to keep it down are available, they will tell you quicker, it will spill over to profit

and I would like to see as much competition as possible.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is all, thank you.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: I have one question only in regard to your recommendation No. 4 where you say the funds should be provided by the Parliament of Canada. I take it there that you are opposed to a license fee or an excise tax and that you would rather see a direct grant?

MR. ANDREW: I am academic but not academic enough to go for a license fee at this time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Andrew, and your associates who came with you. This has been a most interesting brief and we will consider it.

SUBMISSION OF BRITISH COLUMBIA PARENT-TEACHER FEDERATION.

APPEARANCES:

Mrs. W.W. McDonald

Mrs. A.H. Young

Mrs. A.F. Cliff

THE CHAIRMAN: We are going to go longer than the normal time this morning, if you all agree, because this brief is to be presented on behalf of the British Columbia Parent-Teacher Association and I understand Mrs. McDonald, who is presenting the brief, has an important graduation to

attend this afternoon, so if the Commission is agreeable we will sit later than usual. We will begin by marking your brief Exhibit 69.

EXHIBIT NO. 69: Brief of British Columbia Parent-Teacher Federation.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have with you Mrs. A.H. Young and Mrs. A.F. Cliff?

MRS. McDONALD: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you then proceed with the presentation of your brief?

MR. McDONALD: Mr. Chairman, because it is getting late and because you have already seen our brief, I will just present to you at this time a short summary and then try to answer any questions you may have. The British Columbia Parent-Teacher Federation is primarily and only interested in the timing and the content of programmes and do not feel qualified to make any recommendations regarding financing, nor to enter into debate relating to the advantages or disadvantages of private or public ownership of T.V. or radio stations. Our research in the area of programming on these two mediums has resulted in the following observations:

First, we believe that there is a lack of programmes suitable for children between the ages of 8 and 12 years, and we feel there should be more programmes geared to their needs and based on such subjects as hobbies, manual dexterity, instruction and development on sports, dramatization of children's

stories, adventures and animal stories, science and natural phenomena and field trips.

Secondly, we believe that existing programmes are often unsuitable in content and their subject matter is distasteful; they contain many scenes of aggression and mental torment; they convey false standards and ridicule authority.

We feel also that commercial announcements are often in poor taste, and we would recommend more movies on Canadian origins and histories and more programmes relating to scientific developments.

Thirdly, we believe that the timing for programmes is, in many instances, inappropriate and it is particularly, in view of the fact that on the lower mainland CBU-TV must compete with channels that come in from the United States, and while we recognize the difficulties inherent in the timing of programmes, we would suggest that whenever possible programmes be presented at hours suitable to the age of the child who may be viewing.

In summary we wish to make the following recommendations:

1. That care be taken to maintain a balance of programme time for all ages. That existing lack of material for 8 to 12 and 13 to 15-year-old children be remedied.

2. That in designing programmes for children the following facts be considered: The suitability of the subject; the possibility of using an educational theme; the inadvisability of using

aggression and mental torment; the importance of improving the commercial announcements.

3. That the timing of each presentation be analyzed in each region to meet the needs of the area and that these factors be considered as basic requirements regardless of whether the station is privately- or publicly-owned.

4. With regard to radio, the British Columbia Parent-Teacher Federation recommend the continuance of the school broadcasts and that increased daytime advertising should not be allowed to supersede this necessary service to the educational development of children.

That is a very brief summary.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is a very full summary and we have read your brief. Mr. deGrandpre?

MR. deGRANDPRE: Mrs. McDonald, could you tell us more about your Association -- when it was formed and how many members it represents?

MRS. McDONALD: Yes, at the present time the British Columbia Parent-Teacher Federation have 584 associations in this Province with some 47,000 members; we have been formed as a Federation for 34 years.

MR. deGRANDPRE: And that represents practically all the areas of the Province?

MRS. McDONALD: Yes, we have local associations right through British Columbia, although not all schools have Parent-Teacher Associations in them yet.

MR. deGRANDPRE: And could you tell us if this radio and television committee has been in operation for several years, or has it been formed for this set purpose of presenting this brief?

MRS. McDONALD: We have had a radio committee chairman as a standing chairman on the Board of Directors for a number of years and they have informed us individually of what goes on in radio, and our T.V. committee was formed about a year and a half ago, nothing to do with this brief but because our Federation felt a need to watch over what our children would be viewing.

(page

MR. deGRANDPRE: I understand that the brief was prepared with the help of a questionnaire that was sent to your members?

MRS. McDONALD: That is correct, we did a spot survey of members residing in areas where T.V. could be viewed, and most of our recommendations are based on the findings of this questionnaire.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Could you tell us in general terms what questions were asked, or do you have a sample of the questionnaire with you?

MRS. McDONALD: The first one we sent out, questions were asked regarding the age of the children, the hours of T.V. viewing each week, how the children or parents selected programmes -- whether selected by the mother, father, or by the entire family -- there are quite a lot of questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't think we need go into all the detail.

MRS. McDONALD: Such questions as, do you change your mealtime habits, does it affect your children's behaviour, and how long have you had your set.

MR. deGRANDPRE: And this brief represents a condensation of the answers you have received?

MRS. McDONALD: That is correct.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Just a last question on a matter of principle, Mrs. McDonald; I see you that raise the point that there is some commercial sponsorship which would appear unsuitable. Could you tell me as a matter of principle if your Association feels

that all children's programmes should be sustaining programmes, or do you feel that some programmes adapt themselves to sponsorship?

MRS. McDONALD: I don't believe this has ever been discussed in that particular way by our Federation. We object to the type of commercial advertising that puts undue pressure on children to purchase things, that misrepresents to some extent the product and what it will do for the children, and this is what we mean by commercial advertising that we don't approve of. We have never discussed whether we approve of commercial advertising as such.

MR. deGRANDPRE: That is all, Mr. Chairman.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: In the last paragraph of your brief you recommend the continuance of the school broadcast, and that it should be encouraged; could you tell us something of that -- who prepares them, who broadcasts them? Tell us something about them.

MRS. McDONALD: The school broadcasts are prepared by the C.B.C. in various parts of Canada and released through their outlets to the schools, and they deal with many phases of education, and are used by the teachers to supplement the education. They are particularly valuable in rural areas, and they deal with literature, dramatization of novels which the children may be reading, art, and current events and various aspects of education. They come on every day from 2.00 to 2.30. We have been given to understand that because of the profit on T.V.

advertising at night, radio is getting more and more advertising during the daytime hours, and there is some danger now that the time allotted to the school broadcasts may be given over to commercial advertising, and our Federation feels this would be a very poor thing to do. We feel these broadcasts are most helpful to education and development of our children.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Did you say they were prepared by the C.B.C.?

MRS. McDONALD: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Jointly with the Department of Education in British Columbia?

MRS. McDONALD: East and West co-operate on this, I think. I think originally they started in British Columbia but I am not sure, I may be biased but I think that originally they started in British Columbia, and now I understand they are prepared by different outlets right across Canada.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Do private stations and also the C.B.C. broadcast them throughout the Province?

MRS. McDONALD: Not to my knowledge.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Do they use the local private stations as well as the C.B.C. outlet in British Columbia?

MRS. McDONALD: Not to my knowledge.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: It is solely the C.B.C. in Vancouver?

MRS. McDONALD: Yes, that is correct, or its outlets throughout the Province.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Yes, the private stations affiliated with C.B.C.?

MRS. McDONALD: That would be right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mrs. McDonald, I think you have answered one of my questions to Dean Andrew, or partly answered it, as to whether any public opinion can be brought to bear on this broadcast operation by an organization such as yours of nearly 50,000 members. We are grateful to you for having taken the trouble to bring a brief before us, and we will give it consideration, and thank you for coming.

MRS. McDONALD: Thank you for hearing us this morning.

---The hearings adjourned at 12.45 until 2.30 P.M.

---On resuming at 2.30 P.M.:

THE CHAIRMAN: This afternoon we are to have three briefs, the Commission is very glad to see two of the private station operators, CKLG and CKWX appearing this afternoon and hope we will have more private stations appearing as we go on with our hearings throughout Canada. We also have the Kelowna Arts Council.

The first brief to be presented is by Station CKLG from North Vancouver by Mr. R.T. Bowman.

Mr. Bowman, we have your brief and we will mark it as Exhibit 70, and I would ask you to present it.

EXHIBIT NO. 70: Brief by Station CKLG, North Vancouver.

MR. BOWMAN: Mr. Chairman, would you like me to read the brief or just perhaps go into some of the points arising from it?

THE CHAIRMAN: It is entirely as you wish. What we would like is for you to either read it or give us a fairly adequate summary of it, whichever seems best to you.

MR. BOWMAN: I think I will summarize it, and perhaps if you would like to pick up some points from it, I hope you will ask me about them.

---On resuming at 2.30 P.M.:

THE CHAIRMAN: This afternoon we are to have three briefs, the Commission is very glad to see two of the private station operators, CKLG and CKWX appearing this afternoon and hope we will have more private stations appearing as we go on with our hearings throughout Canada. We also have the Kelowna Arts Council.

The first brief to be presented is by Station CKLG from North Vancouver by Mr. R.T. Bowman.

Mr. Bowman, we have your brief and we will mark it as Exhibit 70, and I would ask you to present it.

EXHIBIT NO. 70: Brief by Station CKLG, North Vancouver.

MR. BOWMAN: Mr. Chairman, would you like me to read the brief or just perhaps go into some of the points arising from it?

THE CHAIRMAN: It is entirely as you wish. What we would like is for you to either read it or give us a fairly adequate summary of it, whichever seems best to you.

MR. BOWMAN: I think I will summarize it, and perhaps if you would like to pick up some points from it, I hope you will ask me about them.

SUBMISSION OF STATION CKLG, NORTH VANCOUVER

I point out in the brief how my father was a member of the original Royal Commission which recommended national broadcasting for Canada, and so I have a deep interest from that point of view.

When I graduated from McGill in 1932 as a Bachelor of Commerce with first-class honours in accountancy, you may remember that there just was not anything to account, and so I became a newspaper reporter, and part of my beat included the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Commission which had been set up by the Conservative Government then. I used to call every day on Mr. Charlesworth and Col. Steele and Mr. Mohair, and I kept close watch on the development. It was clear to me in those days the Radio Commission could not function properly under that set-up. I was lucky enough to get over to England and into the B.B.C. and fell into a job there and got a very good grounding in public service broadcasting from the B.B.C., and during that period I was in close touch with Gladstone Murray, and we felt fully confident that the day would come when the radio structure would be organized, and we decided what we would do when it happened, and it did happen and Gladstone Murray was invited to Canada to take over the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, and I followed along at his invitation afterwards.

Just to prove my sincerity in this matter I might say when I left England at that time I was

earning at the rate of about £4,000 a year -- about $20,000 a year income from my work in England, and I came back to Canada for less than $4,000, and that is how I felt about the C.B.C. $20,000 in those days was really worth $20,000. We never regretted that decision and I put my heart and soul into the development of the C.B.C. as Assistant to Mr. Bushnell, and later as Director of Special Events I saw it grow from a nighttime operation to daytime, with afternoon coverage and then into morning coverage, and we had some ideals and did the very best we could to develop broadcasting in Canada.

It was a matter of great disappointment and bitterness to me that I finally felt I had to leave the C.B.C. in 1943. That is an old story.

I think the Organization, as I have said in my brief to you, is basically sound. I think it is doing a fine job for Canada. At one time I was in charge of the developing programmes for the network as a whole, and in my position as Director of Special Events it was largely my job to develop the broadcasting of the network and I am quite familiar with the demands that are made on a national network from local interests, and I know perfectly well from my own work in the C.B.C. that a national network just cannot take care of community needs. Therefore, I feel there is a place for the national network and for the community station.

Since then I have been actively engaged in managing private stations, and I prefer to think of

them as community stations. I know how useful the C.B.C. can be to us, and I can appreciate the job they are doing. I feel the system is basically sound the way it is set up. I don't think it is being administered in the best possible way, and I think a very useful study could be made of the C.B.C. personnel and see how many are actively engaged in broadcasting or contributing to broadcasting; how many, perhaps, it may be over-staffed.

There was an interesting article in the Vancouver Sun this weekend by an Ottawa columnist, who gives the number of people employed in Toronto, Montreal and Ottawa, and he expresses surprise it is so large and suggests a study be made of those, and that is how I felt, that it was time somebody took a good close look at the Corporation to see how much money is going into actual broadcasting.

THE CHAIRMAN: You know on that we have some quite extensive studies going forward by people engaged by the Commission to study the whole financial operation and structure of the C.B.C. This is happening although the results are not yet before us.

MR. BOWMAN: I think that will be very useful. I am not in a position to say just whether it is efficient or not, but when I left in 1943 I felt it was rapidly becoming inefficient, and that is not for me to decide now.

I think the question of news broadcasting is tremendously important. I believe that radio in

Canada today enters the homes and it influences older and young citizens alike. I think there is great educational value to newscasting and I think our standards should be a great deal higher than they are, and I think steps are urgently needed to cut out the amount of foreign propaganda that we are all carrying in our newscasts and disseminating into the homes of Canada.

I understand Dean Andrew went into that quite extensively this morning, and I am glad to hear that he did. In my brief you will notice I have quoted Sir John Glubb, the deposed Commander of the British Forces in Jordan to show how propaganda is even more powerful than the Army in the Middle East. Well, we are not faced with a situation like that in that we are getting news more suitable for Canadian homes, and not biased. News should be factual, and I don't think it is.

I have touched on short-wave broadcasting. I don't know whether this Commission is interested in that aspect of the situation?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, any comments you have on any aspect such as that, that certainly comes into our over-all study.

MR. BOWMAN: I don't think C.B.C. money is actually being spent on short-wave broadcasting. I believe it is a separate grant from the Government.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is right.

MR. BOWMAN: So I don't know whether it comes into this picture, but I do believe we can do

a far more effective job of telling Canada's story abroad to the other people of the world if we recorded our programmes here in Canada and bought time on commercial in other parts of the world so they could be heard by people in their homes.

I don't think many people in the world today are listening to the short-wave radio, and if we wanted to do an effective job of telling Canada's story, I would say do it by good reception and not by very insecure short-wave reception. I have had a great deal of experience with that.

I haven't touched on television, but my views on television are somewhat the same as they are on broadcasting.

I think that competition is very good for broadcasting. I have mentioned that I think the C.B.C. wastes a great deal of money policing the privately-owned stations. Competition takes care of that. I think there should be competition in television just as there is in broadcasting. I think it is almost fantastic that here in Canada if you don't like a television programme you have to tune to an American station to get another. No broadcast station is good enough to please all the people all the time, and radio listeners can turn to another station, and I think the same should be true of television stations. I don't think we should drive our people to American stations to get an alternative programme.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is pretty well your

summary?

MR. BOWMAN: I didn't mention very much in my brief about developing talent and drama in Canada, and I didn't know whether you wanted to ask me about that or wanted me to go into it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, go into it now and we may have questions later.

MR. BOWMAN: One of the most important jobs the C.B.C. can do is develop talent in Canada, musical and dramatic, and develop broadcasts, of course. A lot of money that has been spent in other directions should be turned towards the purpose of developing talent in Canada. When I was with the C.B.C. I suggested a number of schemes for that and I still think they are sound. One of them was to develop competetent radio producers in Canada. We always think a certain number of people in the C.B.C. did a good job and still are -- first-rate men. I am not always confident that we are developing new men, and I used to advocate we bring our junior producers from all parts of Canada to the big centre where these first-rate people were, and have a sort of apprentice system where the senior men would always have a junior man attached to them, and then he could go back to his home territory with that experience. Right across Canada you have a large number of drama and musical and amateur groups always struggling to produce music or plays and very often they don't go ahead because they haven't got competent direction, and perhaps they haven't got scripts to work with,

and perhaps they haven't got music to work with. The C.B.C. has an abundance of that material available. I think the C.B.C. could make dramatic and musical producers available to local drama and musical groups so they could help them with their music and scripts, and as the results came along they would get some direction from the trainer people and when ready they could be given opportunities on the air with this training in the background, and I feel that would be a great help to our country as a whole, bringing in the dramatic and musical development of Canada, and I think the C.B.C. could play a big part in that field.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your brief and for your comments and points of view, Mr. Bowman.

MR. deGRANDPRE: I think for the purposes of convenience, Mr. Bowman, I will go through your brief and I will indicate where I would like some clarification or explanation. You state in the first paragraph of page 3 of your brief that the C.B.C. cannot possibly cope with national and community activity at the same time, and if I am right you seem to relate that to your personal experience. Could you clarify this statement for us?

MR. BOWMAN: Well, as Director of Special Events of the C.B.C., we would get requests every now and again to broadcast hockey games that were very important to certain communities. Let us say, for example, that Port Arthur was playing Winnipeg in the semi-final of the Allan Cup play-offs. We would get requests to put that on the national network

so it could be heard by the communities interested in it. Well, either we did it and annoyed other parts of Canada because they had to listen to a hockey game between Port Arthur and Winnipeg, or else turned down the request and annoyed the people of Port Arthur and Winnipeg. I think that is a job that is done very well by the community radio stations being allowed to link together in a temporary network for that purpose. It just does not come within the scope of the national organization.

MR. deGRANDPRE: But if you allow these stations which are part of the network to become, let us call them, absolutely independent for an evening, don't you disrupt the national service by doing that, and therefore don't you prevent the national organization from performing the role that it is supposed to play under the Act?

MR. BOWMAN: You don't have to use the stations on the network for it. There are generally other non-network stations which can be linked up in this way to provide coverage, and that is what happens largely today.

THE CHAIRMAN: This does happen today?

MR. BOWMAN: Oh, yes.

MR. deGRANDPRE: You would not go so far as to say that the Trans-Canada Network should be disrupted to give a chance to local broadcasts to take place at the expense of the national service?

MR. BOWMAN: I don't think it is necessary -- not very often. Usually you can get local stations

now to do the job. That is what we do.

MR. deGRANDPRE: That would apply in areas where there are alternative services, but in areas where there is only one station serving the community, that could not take place?

MR. BOWMAN: Yes. I don't think you will find large areas very often now.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Assuming that a particular area can only be served by one station, what would be your suggestion?

MR. BOWMAN: Better get a local community station; it needs one.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Yes, but would you think that the local interest should supersede the national interest, or do you think the national service should come first?

MR. BOWMAN: I suppose it is quite possible to detach a station from the national network for an evening if you have to, to devote it to the local cause, but I don't think it is a very good principle. After all, the C.B.C. can spend a great deal of money producing a national programme; it may be the Toronto Symphony Orchestra, and a lot of money and thought is going into that, and there are people in that very community who don't want to listen to the hockey game. They want to hear the Toronto Symphony. So, you cut the station off the network and decrease the value of the work that has gone into that. I hope that is clear, Mr. deGrandpre.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Well ---

MR. BOWMAN: That is just one example, but I am a manager of a community station and we are constantly being besieged with demands.

MR. deGRANDPRE: That is exactly what I have in mind; being besieged with demands all the time, is there not a danger or a possibility that you will eventually disrupt the national service?

MR. BOWMAN: If we were part of the national network we would, yes. It is better to have a community station to handle all these local demands.

THE CHAIRMAN: This applies, just following on from that, to the system of radio that we now have?

MR. BOWMAN: Exactly.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you care to make any comments as to the possible application of it to television which we all have to see at a different stage of development? Not only a different stage of development but different technical problems are involved.

MR. BOWMAN: Well, I think television will be in exactly the same position as radio. There will be local demands to be met just the same. I can't see any great difference.

THE CHAIRMAN: Except, apparently, at the moment there are technologically many more alternative radio channels available than there are television channels.

MR. BOWMAN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Techniques may develop and change that, but we don't know that yet.

MR. BOWMAN: I don't know how many local television stations there is room for. It would depend on that; but I think there should always be one alternative, anyhow.

MR. deGRANDPRE: In the next paragraph you indicate that the nationally-owned network is equally important to the welfare of commercial stations in Canada; what do you mean exactly by being important to the welfare of commercial stations in Canada?

MR. BOWMAN: Well, there are certain things that happen in Canada that we all like to cover. We like to be included in them, and we just could not go out and cover them ourselves without the proper facilities for doing it, and that is when the national service is very useful to us. Take the annual Christmas message that the Queen gives; it is given by the Royal Family and we like to be included in the family circle on Christmas Day. I think that would be an example. Perhaps the Prime Minister is making an important speech in Ottawa that affects the national welfare of the country, and I think we all like to be united at times like this and have our part of it.

MR. deGRANDPRE: In that case would you suggest the policy that has been followed up to now, namely, free service to private stations, be continued; or do you feel the private stations should pay part of the cost?

MR. BOWMAN: No, I think it should be a free service because we help the national service quite often. A privately-owned station will be asked to do jobs to help; we complement each other.

MR. deGRANDPRE: And by doing this you don't feel the C.B.C. is subsidizing the private station -- to use the word which has been used during our hearings?

MR. BOWMAN: No, I think we subsidize the national network too. We help each other.

MR. deGRANDPRE: To what extent do you help the C.B.C.?

MR. BOWMAN: Quite often a privately-owned station will go out and make a pick-up for the C.B.C. and do a job they ask us to do, or simply by taking care of local needs, we help them. We take a lot of pressure off the C.B.C.

THE CHAIRMAN: The way it was put to us by Mr. Dunton, I think it was, was that the private station was helping the C.B.C. by giving the service distribution in its normal day-in-and-day-out operations; is that correct?

MR. BOWMAN: Yes, a lot of private stations do give the C.B.C. distribution, and there are a lot more who are not on the C.B.C. networks at all but still help the C.B.C. by taking care of local needs. I think it goes beyond what Mr. Dunton had to say.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, he was speaking in the same sense of being a complementary service.

MR. BOWMAN: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: That the C.B.C. prepared the programmes, but the private stations gave them distribution which the C.B.C. wanted.

MR. BOWMAN: Yes. As Director of Special Events I used to get demands on the network from certain areas, and I do wish in those days I could have turned to a private station and asked them to handle it. We didn't have the same number of stations in those days. I know how valuable it would have been to me in my job as Director of Special Events if I could have called on private stations.

MR. deGRANDPRE: I see your point when the area served by a private station is exclusively served by a private station connected with the basic services of the network, but when a private station runs in parallel to the network for any given area would the same answer apply, that this additional private station should receive this service free of charge because of the outlet it has given in the past to C.B.C. broadcasts?

MR. BOWMAN: I think so.

MR. deGRANDPRE: So you would not make any distinction between a basic station and a station which is not a basic station?

MR. BOWMAN: No.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Where is the quid pro quo in that case between the C.B.C. and the secondary privately-owned station in any given area?

MR. BOWMAN: Well, the second privately-owned station, and I am managing one now, we don't carry any network programmes, but we are prepared to help the C.B.C. at any time in our area. Perhaps something happens over in my territory; well, if

they ask us, we will be out there and do any kind of coverage they would like us to do, and occasionally we may ask to be included on a special network so we can carry a broadcast by the Queen.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Where does the preponderance lie? Does the C.B.C. provide you with more service in the case of your own station than you would reciprocate with for the C.B.C.?

MR. BOWMAN: No, I think it is just about equal.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Later on in the next paragraph you take exception to the value of networks to a certain extent, and you say:

"Commercial radio via network is out-of-
"date except for sport events, and a few
"other features."

This is rather a broad statement, and I would like to get some more precise information on it. What do you mean by "a few other features"?

MR. BOWMAN: Well, I was having a hard time of thinking of any, to tell you the truth, but there is a programme called "Singing Stars of Tomorrow" where they bring young singers from various parts of the country to Toronto and they compete for an award, and eventually I think they perhaps get the opportunity to go right through to the Metropolitan Opera Company. That is a commercial programme that perhaps has a national interest because the singers come from various parts of the country. But for the most part today I know if I were the owner

of a big national company in Toronto or Montreal and I wanted to get my product advertised on radio in all parts of Canada, I would have my programmes transcribed, or I would go out and buy local features in local communities so that my advertising message would be heard at exactly the right time in each community. Do I make myself clear?

MR. deGRANDPRE: I am not an experienced broadcaster, but as a listener or a viewer it seems to me there are several commercial sponsors using network time?

MR. BOWMAN: Yes. Well, that is their privilege. I think most of them would do a far more effective job if they bought local time. Supposing you spent a lot of money on a programme that is going to be seen in Toronto at 9.00 o'clock at night: well, that is 10.00 o'clock in Winnipeg and Saint John, and 10.30 in Newfoundland. It is about 6.30 out here, or something, which is not a very suitable time for perhaps that type of programme. A symphony concert is a very good example of that. You spend a lot of money producing a programme like that to be shown from 9.00 to 10.00 o'clock and it hits Vancouver from 6.00 o'clock to 7.00 o'clock at night. If I were a big commercial sponsor I would rather have my symphony concert heard at 9.00 o'clock in Vancouver, and you cannot do it on account of the differential in the time. It is better to buy local talent and have it heard at 9.00 o'clock right across the country by using transcriptions rather than network.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Would there be a degradation of quality caused by the fact that it was a transcription?

MR. BOWMAN: Oh, no. As a matter of fact, you lose quite a lot of quality on the network -- coming across the network -- and transcription improves quality. Sometimes Toronto quality is poor here coming through on land lines, whereas if you have these things recorded on high fidelity type recordings they are beautiful. There are other things an advertiser can do. If I were in Toronto I would come out here and buy local features developed right here in our own communities to reach the maximum audience with great efficiency. I think network commercial radio is not finished: there are lots of useful things that it can do, but I don't think there is enough revenue there.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Do you think transcription of the Toronto Symphony would come cheaper, rather than using wires?

MR. BOWMAN: No, no. The recording costs are pretty heavy, but you would get better coverage. It may cost you more.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: It may cost more?

MR. BOWMAN: Yes, to transcript it and buy local time, than to buy the network, but you would get far more effective coverage, because your programme would be heard at 9.00 o'clock at night and not 6.00 o'clock.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that because of the discount system or out-of-pocket costs?

MR. BOWMAN: It is out-of-pocket costs. The Musicians' Union charges a lot more for having a programme recorded than for live. I think it costs almost triple.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Is this transcription procedure that you outline not, in fact, a delayed network programme?

MR. BOWMAN: That is correct.

MR. deGRANDPRE: So that your remark saying that the network is out-of-date, you would say that the live network is out-of-date but that the network system with a delay to present the broadcast at the same time in the different time zones would be more effective?

MR. BOWMAN: Yes, that is a way of getting around it, but it is very awkward; when you adopt that system you disrupt your national network, the moment you do that. The very question you asked me earlier about detaching certain stations from a network, the moment you get into that delayed broadcast business you are disrupting your national network.

MR. deGRANDPRE: But if you don't delay the broadcast and if you originate the broadcast at 10.00 o'clock in the East, that would be too early in the West?

MR. BOWMAN: Yes.

MR. deGRANDPRE: But if your programme originated in Vancouver, for instance, at 10.00 o'clock, how would you catch your viewers or listeners in the East?

MR. BOWMAN: That is right, it is awkward either way you look at it. That is why I think commercial radio by network is largely out-of-date. It is better to transcribe your programmes and send them out to local stations so they can be broadcast at local times, or use a different method of advertising -- a different type of programme.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Is it possible under present C.B.C. regulations for the private stations to use recordings of C.B.C. presentations?

MR. BOWMAN: Not C.B.C. presentations, no. They just go to the C.B.C. stations. But I was thinking about a commercial sponsor, let us call it the X Manufacturing Company in Toronto, and it wants to get radio coverage right across Canada: well, I will give X Company far better coverage in Vancouver if he buys local time on my station than he will get than by going on a network.

MR. deGRANDPRE: What kind of programme would you give a sponsor on a local station?

MR. BOWMAN: Well, if a question or recording costs came into it, probably he would be better not to use the Toronto Symphony Orchestra and pay triple fees. He would be better off to use another feature which can be more easily recorded and still be good, where the recorded costs are not so high -- perhaps a short dramatic piece without music in it. There are dozens and dozens of programmes like that.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Is there not a tendency by doing that of reducing the quality of the

programme because the cost cannot be spread over many stations?

MR. BOWMAN: No, I think your quality programme that you are trying to get across Canada is still available through your national network. I think that is the C.B.C.'s job, to produce quality programmes of that kind.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Yes, but what would be good for the C.B.C. network would not be good for the commercial sponsor: I can't follow you there. You say it would be the task of the C.B.C. to produce a programme which could be transmitted on the network; that is all right, but when you come to a commercial programme you say it is out-of-date?

MR. BOWMAN: That is right.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Why make the distinction between the two? If it is out-of-date for one, for a sustaining programme, why wouldn't it also be out-of-date for a commercial programme or vice versa?

MR. BOWMAN: I think a commercial sponsor is looking for a better audience all the time. He is more interested in getting down to the grass roots and getting the biggest audience at the best time. He is trying to sell his products. The C.B.C. attitude does not have to be as vital as that. I don't think the C.B.C. has to be concerned with getting maximum audience. It hopes the programme will be good enough so that people who are interested will tune in to it no matter what time it goes on.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Do you feel the CBC should not concern itself with the volume of its audience?

MR. BOWMAN: Oh, certainly, they want to be concerned with the volume but I do not think they are as vitally concerned as a commercial sponsor which is using radio to reach a great many people.

MR. deGRANDPRE: So, if I understand your thought correctly, the approach of the CBC trying to reach the maximum number of viewers or listeners should be different from the approach of the commercial sponsor?

MR. BOWMAN: Do not pin me down to black and white because there is a margin there, but I do not think the CBC has to be in the spot that an advertising agency is in when it is busy marketing the goods for its sponsor.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Well, pushing this argument further, do you not feel if the show is worth being produced is is also worth being seen by a great many people?

MR. BOWMAN: Oh, yes I think so, but I am just saying if I were a commercial man in Toronto, I owned a big company and I wanted to advertise my product over radio I would buy my time on local community stations and I would get the most attractive coverage that way.

THE CHAIRMAN: Coverage on what?

MR. BOWMAN: People.

THE CHAIRMAN: How do you get your program developed in that manner you are suggesting.

MR. BOWMAN: Well, there are several ways of doing that; you might have a representative come to us and say "X manufacuturing company wants to buy time on your station, he wants to reach the ladies audience primarily and would like to hit them in the morning some time, now have you a feature which you can recommend that would get these results?" I naturally would say, "yes, we have" and see what we could make available and I think we could get a bigger audience than they would get by a network broadcast. I think the figures will bear that out.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is what you are saying then that you believe for effective advertising by way of the radio the commercial sponsor should really go through a series of local broadcasts rather than to have a national broadcast?

MR. BOWMAN: Yes, I think it is more effective that way.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would that not mean that you would have a whole series of what you might call small local programs rather than some of the bigger national programs?

MR. BOWMAN: It tends that way, I think it is more effective. Now, mind you, there is no

reason at all why a sponsor in Toronto or Montreal or wherever it may be cannot have a program made through a record and have a great many of those recordings made and sent out to the local stations to local coverage, a lot of them do that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Except the added cost which you mentioned, if it has music on it.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Or if it is a live show then do not the artists demand more for reproduction.

MR. BOWMAN: That is right, it is all in the costs, you set out the situation, the advantages and disadvantages of what he wants to do. I just say that I think the days of commercial network radio are not finished, there are useful things that can be done, but the old days of the Jack Benny shows and the Fred Allen shows used to go coast to coast at a certain time, Vancouver at noon and Halifax at 8 o'clock at night, advertisers do not go into that any more, if they want to sell things they buy time on the local stations and they send us transcriptions or buy features we are developing ourselves.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. deGrandpre's question was, if from a commercial sponsors point of view he gets a better group of people by this method of presentation or local timing then why would not the same apply to these CBC sustaining shows, do they not also want good coverage?

MR. BOWMAN: Yes, they do, and it might be a way of doing it. You do away with the national network altogether and do everything by recording.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the question is, we are not making any suggestion, but the question is, is that a reasonable implication of what you are saying or is it not?

MR. BOWMAN: No, I do not think so, I do not think it has to be black or white. I think the national network programs have a very good place in our listening habits and I do not mind listening to the New York Philharmonic at 12 o'clock noon here when I was used to listening to it at 3 or 4 o'clock in the afternoon in Ottawa or the Maritimes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you rather listen to it at 3 or 4 in the afternoon by transcription?

MR. BOWMAN: I think there is something nice about a live program coming from Massey Hall in Toronto, you know the audience is there and know what is going on at the moment.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: You say, Mr. Bowman, that the transcription trebles the costs because of higher fees, artists and musicians, do you happen to know why the artists and musicians - I suppose we can ask them when they appear - but why should they ask for so much more if the program is to be transcribed; if they broadcast alive they reach all of Canada, through transcriptions they reach all

of Canada, what is the argument they used in negotiating such contracts, do you happen to know?

MR. BOWMAN: I would not like to quote it because it is not exactly my field. Incidentally, I did not mean to say trebled, I said trebled but I am not absolutely certain of that.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: It costs more?

MR. BOWMAN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Appreciably more?

MR. BOWMAN: Yes, it may be that they feel that their work is being duplicated, the moment they record it it may be performed more than once, in other words, in a sense they are giving more than one performance, therefore, they should be paid on that basis.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: You have the same situation in the motion picture business. I do not know what the contracts are there, but the motion picture film is distributed all over the world and seen probably every day for a year or more.

MR. BOWMAN: Yes, I think it is customary, an author who writes a book is usually paid on the circulation of the book he gets a basic fee and when the book sells beyond that point he gets more.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: That is true, but in this instance the time would be the same

except for the different time in each section of the country, it reaches the very same audience I should think - perhaps we should ask the artists and musicians that question but do you happen to know what their argument was?

MR. BOWMAN: I would think their work is being played more because it is transcribed and therefore, they think they should be paid more on the national network their program may be released by 30 radio stations, if it is transcribed and used to cover the country perhaps it is released by 80 radio stations.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, what that comes to is the fact that your circulation is bigger by this alternative method than it is by the distribution.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: And the proceeds would be greater, would they not if it is used commercially?

MR. BOWMAN: The artist perhaps is not concerned about that, he just wants to be paid for his performance. He is not so concerned from the advertisors point of view. It would be a good question to ask the actors union and the musicians union when they appear before you.

MR. deGRANDPRE: At page 4 of your brief Mr. Bowan, it is tied up with your remark that the CBC was rapidly becoming inefficient and you add in the second paragraph:

"In my opinion, too much CBC revenue is

being diverted to administration and unnecessary activities such as policing the privately owned stations."

As the chairman has indicated we have our financial experts doing work on the financial aspects, but could you give us some routes or open up some avenues to facilitate our work along these lines?

MR. BOWMAN: Well along the lines of policing the privately owned stations, I do not know how big that department is or how much they spend on it but sometimes we have to follow the most obsolete arrangements, some of them I am glad to say have been discarded in the last couple of years. Perhaps you can remember when we were not allowed to mention prices, we had to put out advertising without mentioning prices. Well, who are we helping by that kind of regulation, if I hear an advertisement on the radio advertising something I want to know the price, but the CBC regulation was no network should tell anybody what the price was and we were allowed to say that John Jones was having a big sale of something or other but we were not allowed to give the price. What sense is there in that? There have been regulations of no spot announcement after 7.30 at night well, why? Was it just reserved for one class of sponsor, to me this regulation did not make sense. Spot announcements on Sunday, you

are not allowed to broadcast but if somebody wanted to come along and buy half an hour they could put four or five spots on it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Those are perfectly valid criticisms of the regulations, but do they in fact involve a diversion of revenue to the policing of the privately owned stations? I mean what you are saying here?

MR. BOWMAN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: While I can see your criticism of certain regulations, did they in fact go ahead and spend money policing it.

MR. BOWMAN: Yes, they have a department, wherever it is, we have to send our logs to them everyday and presumabley they have a group of men who look over it and see that we do not broadcast - well, it is not the case now because they have done away with most of it but there is one we have to do now, whenever we broadcast a recording, a recorded commerial announcment the announcer has to say "by Transcription". This is the CBC regulation, our announcer has to say "by transcription" and then you hear the announcement about going out to buy someone's soap. My control room operator has to sit there and mark on the log to show that my announcer said "by transcription". Well, who cares? I want my control room operator

doing his job there, that we are on cue, that we are doing a good efficient production job, and he has to get his pencil out and mark the log, then we have to mark on the log whether the Joe Blow baby carriage spot lasted 47 seconds or 52 seconds, well, I do not know why they are so interested in Ottawa or Toronto or wherever they do this work. I think that is a problem for me to handle, if it is too long, we will whittle it down.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not want to appear to be pressing you on this but we are most anxious to run down any possible line of inquiry that will lead to greater efficiency or to saving of expenses by the C.B.C., particularly if they are unnecessary expenses, and, again, this may be a regulation to which you object but I am not clear at the moment as to how it involves a diversion of revenue into the policing of private stations from the revenue and economy point of view.

MR. BOWMAN: The C.B.C. is expending money in maintaining a staff to examine our daily logs to see we carry out these regulations; I think they could use that money for developing talent or something else.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, do you think there should be no regulation of such things as spot announcements?

MR. BOWMAN: No, I do not think it is

necessary.

THE CHAIRMAN: You think the spot announcement could be allowed to run its course?

MR. BOWMAN: Sure.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Would you tell me whether there are any regulations in the United States as to the amount of time in any one hour that can be allotted to advertising, because apparently there is some regulation in this country?

MR. BOWMAN: I do not know, I do not believe there is, but I cannot quote with authority on that.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Your own opinion is that the broadcasting business will regulate this by trying to compete for the audience?

MR. BOWMAN: Oh, yes.

MR. deGRANDPRE: That is in summary what you have told us, that the broadcasting body who set down the rules are just conflicting the issues because you do not achieve a better result?

MR. BOWMAN: I do not think we do, no, I think it lessens the efficiency of broadcasting stations to obey these regulations which have been senseless; there is nothing to recommend them like the one of not mentioning the price.

MR. deGRANDPRE: That is something in the past?

MR. BOWMAN: Yes.

MR. deGRANDPRE: We are trying to look at the future.

MR. BOWMAN: Well, the business of having

to report every day how many seconds we have on spot announcements.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Do you not feel that is the only way you can regulate the length of commercial announcements on any station?

MR. BOWMAN: We regulate them ourselves; I am not going to have long spot announcements on our station and use up all the time, more time than an advertiser has paid for. We really do that in our own organization.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, not more than what the advertiser has paid for, but suppose the advertiser was willing to pay for spot announcements for the whole 30 minutes in the half-hour?

MR. BOWMAN: We would not let him, we would say it was a bad programme and he would be getting a very poor result, he would be wasting his money.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Well, the advertiser would not go on your station unless you had an audience to listen, and if you had to make announcements they would not listen and he would not advertiser, so you become your own regulator?

MR. BOWMAN: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does that mean that in your view there should be no regulation of programme content at all?

MR. BOWMAN: We get into that black-and-white business again.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point is, we get into this by reason of the money being spent by policing,

if there is any money we can save in this operation let us do it, but if you have some regulation you have to have some policing.

MR. BOWMAN: I think probably there are some very important things; I think it is important that there should be certain regulations about what can be broadcast, perhaps copy that has to do with drugs or something like that should be carefully examined, and I think it is done by the Department of National Health or could be. There are one or two factors that need it.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: But you do not believe in regulating time for commercials to 15 minutes or half an hour?

MR. BOWMAN: No.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: You leave it to the station to determine how much is enough?

MR. BOWMAN: That is right. We hurt ourselves very critically if we become over-commercial and flood our programmes with commercials; we would lose audiences quickly.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have no figures at all, we will probably get them when the financial study that is being made is completed, but you have no idea of how much of the C.B.C. budget is given over to policing?

MR. BOWMAN: No, I have not any idea at all.

MR. deGRANDPRE: When you refer to inefficient operations, the only point that you had in

mind was about too much or too many regulations or too much regulation, or do you have any other aspects where you feel there is inefficiency that that inefficiency should be further investigated?

MR. BOWMAN: Yes, I think practically the whole business of policing the private stations is inefficient, I think it is a waste of money because we have to take the time out to do these logs and make reports to the Department and it decreases our own efficiency.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Yes, but you are talking about your own, and my question was directed at the C.B.C.'s inefficiency which you mentioned earlier.

MR. BOWMAN: I think if the money that they are spending on policing was channelled into developing taken in Canada they would do a far better job for the country.

MR. deGRANDPRE: But my question was not this. I want to make it quite clear: Did you have anything else in mind but policing when you mentioned that?

THE CHAIRMAN: This inefficiency?

MR. deGRANDPRE: Yes.

MR. BOWMAN: What paragraph is that?

THE CHAIRMAN: Actually it was in your verbal statement, you said it would be an interesting study to look at the administration and operation of the C.B.C. because you had the belief that it was, I think, increasingly inefficient.

MR. BOWMAN: I see what you mean.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. deGrandpre is asking you as to what elements of inefficiency we are looking at?

MR. BOWMAN: I think you are taking care of it now by having this survey made about the amount of money spent on administration and other things and comparing that with expenses in other networks. I will be greatly interested in it. My impressions are just gained from going into C.B.C. offices and seeing the tremendous expansion that is taking place, the number of officials there are, the number of offices there are, the number of secretaries there are, and it seems to me it has just grown beyond the real needs of the country. I do not feel all those people are necessary; just my own impression from the way I have seen it grow is one of inefficiency, top-heavy on the administrative side. I cannot prove this but I am just suggesting it.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Just an impression you received by going in the C.B.C.'s building and offices?

MR. BOWMAN: Yes.

MR. deGRANDPRE: But you have no particular line of approach you could suggest?

MR. BOWMAN: I think if I had the job of running it myself I would not have all these people around.

MR. deGRANDPRE: You also mentioned in your verbal remarks that there should be some alternative programmes to give a chance to the listener to tune in another station instead of simply turning

the knob off because there is no choice.

MR. BOWMAN: Yes, that is right.

MR. deGRANDPRE: I take it you were referring to television when you mentioned that, am I right?

MR. BOWMAN: Yes, I was in that instance.

MR. deGRANDPRE: So what would be your recommendation, then, that all channels be opened to private enterprise immediately? How do you presènt this problem?

MR. BOWMAN: I am not a television expert and I have not studied it, but could I put it another way? I do not see that it is intelligent to say to television viewers here in Vancouver, "if you do not like our programme watch Seattle, watch Bellingham, watch some American station". Surely there should be at least one Canadian alternative that they can turn to.

THE CHAIRMAN: At public expense?

MR. BOWMAN: No, private enterprises willing to do the job. Why do it at public expense?

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, this was the point we were on, I do not know whether you were here this morning but Mr. Goode was here and it was brought out by questioning that as far as we have got the evidence so far -- and this is another one that has to be checked -- the advantage of a new station does involve a cost to the national Treasury, and that is a question that is posed by the suggestion of opening a second television station;even though it is built by private money the servicing of it with the national

programmes or part of the national programme involves public expenditure and, therefore, the question of choice is slightly different to the way you put it a moment ago.

MR. BOWMAN: Supposing private enterprise approached you and said they were perfectly willing to put up a television station here in Vancouver, and would not use any C.B.C. programmes at all; that the C.B.C. did not have to serve them, they would do it themselves; would that help the problem?

THE CHAIRMAN: It might, but when we put the same question to Mr. Goode he said it ought to carry and should be supplied with C.B.C. programmes, although I think he said that the private stations should pay for them.

MR. BOWMAN: That would be fair enough; of course, as I say, it is outside my field.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are having some difficulty in getting just what the proposition is on this opening of alternative stations.

MR. BOWMAN: Well, you take a station like Bellingham in the United States which is providing the second television coverage in the Vancouver market, they are not getting any programmes from the C.B.C. I think a private operator here could do at least as well without calling on the C.B.C.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: By offering American programmes?

MR. BOWMAN: By offering programmes, I do not know where you buy them, whether you buy them

from Canadian sources or from American sources; I would certainly like to think we could buy good Canadian programmes which I think are now being produced by film studios in Canada.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you know if Bellingham is one of the C.B.S. or A.B.C. hook-ups?

MR. BOWMAN: I cannot tell you that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Following this trend of thought, you concluded your verbal remarks by saying that you were of course in favour of developing musical and dramatic talent and trying to produce as many Canadian programmes as possible. Would you think that the economics of broadcasting would work against such Canadian programming in the case of alternative private stations?

MR. BOWMAN: That our programmes would be too expensive to produce, perhaps ---

MR. deGRANDPRE: And that the import of American programming would make it very attractive to import them?

MR. BOWMAN: Well, I think there would be a tendency that way all right. You know, if I had a television station here myself -- I am not a television expert -- I would do exactly as I do on the radio station; I would design local programmes, programmes of local interest as much as possible and they are not as costly as these outside productions that you bring in. Without having practical experience in television, I think I could develop T.V.

programmes that would be just as interesting as some of the things they bring in from the outside.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have forgotten who put this to us, but this case was put as an example; that in the television field the costs are high -- I think I remember the figures, a minimum-sized American spectacular costs $30,000; the rough equivalent of it in Canada costs $10,000, not quite as elaborate, not quite as expensive, but you can rent the Canadian rights of the American production for $2,000. Now, as a commercial operator which would you do?

MR. BOWMAN: Oh, I would certainly have some of my programme schedule filled up with the programmes I could buy economically.

(Page

THE CHAIRMAN: I think this is the way the economics, it has been suggested to us, is run.

MR. BOWMAN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: But if you are in business as an operator, would you ever have that kind of programme on except if it were imported?

MR. BOWMAN: Oh, yes, I think, for myself, I would try to develop some local features that would not cost a great deal of money, and yet they would be interesting.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is not quite the question. If the 10,000 figure for Canadian programmes is a valid figure, then, for you to produce another alternative programme at $2,000 in Canada -- it is not going to comparable, is it?

MR. BOWMAN: Not the same type of programme?

THE CHAIRMAN: That is right.

MR. BOWMAN: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: So that type of programme would have to come in by import?

MR. BOWMAN: If you want to have a programme that features Paul Whiteman and his orchestra and some singer, you are going to have to spend quite a bit of money, but everybody doesn't want to watch that. I would be much happier watching a discussion on hunting and fishing given by experts sitting round a table and discussing a fish they caught off the Lion's Gate Bridge last week. Somebody else is watching a programme that cost $30,000 produce, and my programme may have cost $100.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you agree with Dean Matthews that we should try to produce programmes in Canada of a peculiarly Canadian nature not necessarily in the pattern of other countries?

MR. BOWMAN: And they pay off better. You produce programmes that really get into the homes of the people to whom you are broadcasting, and they feel they are part of it; you are building an audience.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Just a last question about this international service that you mentioned. You say that people are no longer interested in trying to tune in short-wave and getting interference and everything, and that you would rather see a good transcript of a Canadian programme being sent over to foreign countries and then being re-transmitted on local stations and with the international service?

MR. BOWMAN: Yes.

MR. deGRANDPRE: And it would, of course, be possible for some countries where they are prepared to sell the time, but isn't the international service precisely designed to reach countries where we cannot buy the time?

MR. BOWMAN: Yes, I think that is true. I think if we did not have the short-wave service that we would miss some places where you know there is not a commercial station available, but I think we would get many more listeners, even millions more listeners by using existing radio stations than we do now. Which is more important, to miss a few isolated places in the world or to get millions more

listeners? I would think it would be a much better bargain to get millions more listeners.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think perhaps Mr. deGrandpre is trying to point out it is at least open to debate as to whether the operations of the international service fall within our order-in-council now. I don't see what we are going to decide on that, but it is not too clear.

MR. BOWMAN: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't want to stop the questioning if you feel you should go on.

MR. deGRANDPRE: I felt I should cover that because I was under the impression -- and correct me if I am wrong -- that the international service was designed to reach European countries and also countries behind the Iron Curtain.

MR. BOWMAN: Yes.

MR. deGRANDPRE: And if that is so, then the only way of reaching these countries would be by way of short-wave radio.

MR. BOWMAN: Getting behind the Iron Curtain -- I don't know how many European commercial stations the people behind the Iron Curtain can hear. There are commercial stations operating in Germany now, and they must get in pretty well. Supposing we felt we should have some Canadian programmes on short-wave; why not make a deal with B.B.C. and put them on the British short-wave service? They have always been very co-operative there. Then we could go out ourselves and cover the mass audience

by buying time on European stations. I think the B.B.C. would be very glad to co-operate on that.

MR. deGRANDPRE: You feel it should be transcribed and shipped over to the station which would be more apt to reach the area than you would normally -- more apt to reach it by long-wave than trying to reach it by short-wave?

MR. BOWMAN: Yes, we could have Canadian programmes designed in the language of the country in which they were intended to be heard, and they would be heard with perfect reception.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: One of the tasks laid upon us is to look into the finances of the C.B.C. because apparently they are a bit worried about that. Under the suggestion you made, would it be much more expensive to operate that way than in the manner in which they are doing now -- if we had to go out and buy time in those countries?

MR. BOWMAN: I don't believe it would. I can't speak with knowledge. Somebody would have to make a study, but I think it would be more economical.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Perhaps you are not aware this is being done more and more by this service -- transcribed programmes sent abroad. I know it is done in South America. In fact, it is done free of charge by most of the radio stations there owned by the Government; Canadian programmes every week; half-hour programmes, sometimes drama, recorded music, in the language of the country, broadcast free by the Government -- transcriptions coming

from the C.B.C. However, as the Chairman pointed out, this is not in our terms of reference.

MR. BOWMAN: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: It has a very wide appeal and people like them.

MR. BOWMAN: Good.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Just one question comes to my mind: You have touched very lightly in your brief and in your remarks on it, but I would like to have your opinion on this. It has been suggested that Canadian programming had to stop at, let us say, about 50% of the C.B.C. production, and others suggested we could increase the proportion of Canadian programming on the C.B.C. network. What is your opinion on this? Do you think that there is a limit to the percentage of Canadian programming that can be made in Canada taking into consideration the amount of creative talent and the number of performers, or do you feel that we shall never reach the bottom?

MR. BOWMAN: I think we can reach it. I don't think it is available now. That is why I think money should be devoted to helping develop talent in Canada, and when we do a proper job along those lines I am sure we have an abundance of talent in Canada.

MR. deGRANDPRE: It is there but you have to find it?

MR. BOWMAN: You have to develop it; you have to help them, and that can be done through having trained personnel available to help these

people and give them the use of scripts to work with and things they need. Most of them are pathetically equipped, and they have no direction or perhaps incompetent direction.

MR. deGRANDPRE: You are not afraid, even with all these precautions, we shall never be able to exceed a certain percentage -- I am not suggesting any figure, but we shall not be able to exceed a certain proportion of Canadian productions on our networks?

MR. BOWMAN: I am sure we could have all the production we need to service the network from our resources in Canada if we wanted to. I don't think it is altogether desirable, but if we wanted to I think we could. It is nice to be able to get programmes from other countries in.

MR. deGRANDPRE: That is all, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Bowman; we appreciate your coming.

MR. BOWMAN: Thank you.

SUBMISSION OF KELOWNA ARTS COUNCIL

APPEARANCES:

Miss Linsey Crossley

THE CHAIRMAN: The next submission is to be made by the Kelowna Arts Council. Miss Linsey Crossley is to present this brief.

Miss Crossley, we thank you for coming, and we will mark your brief as Exhibit No. 71.

EXHIBIT NO. 71: Brief submitted by the Kelowna Arts Council.

MISS CROSSLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Would you like me to read this brief?

THE CHAIRMAN: It is short. I think it might be a good idea if you would, thank you.

MISS CROSSLEY: We realize that, in most cosmopolitan centres, the interest is now television, whereas, in the Okanagan Valley, we are still awaiting an opportunity to listen to good radio programmes -- a freedom of choice which has been available for some years in most other areas.

Although the local station (CKOV) does carry about 27 hours weekly of C.B.C. programmes, some fifteen hours of this are morning soap operas and commercials. Well over 90% of the music carried could be described only as "teen age pops". While we recognize a proportion of our population appreciates this sort of music, there is also a growing audience which desires a choice in the music, drama and educational programmes so readily available

in most other areas.

Since 1949 the Kelowna Arts Council and other interested groups have sent letters asking for better radio service to the local station and to C.B.C.'s Vancouver, Toronto and Ottawa offices. Petitions have also been forwarded through the local M.P. Relevant extracts from this correspondence are supplied on the attached sheet.

There have been no audible results. We feel that the existence in the Okanagan Valley of a mass of electronic equipment capable of making a loud and continuous noise is no proof that the area has good radio programme service. What we are looking for is a choice of music, drama and educational programmes.

Hundreds of young people each year enter the Okanagan Valley Music Festivals. The interest aroused in good music during the festivals is mullified during the balance of the year, as these young people are unable to select programmes locally which would help them maintain good judgment in the musical world.

At various times in the past C.B.C. has considered the establishment of a second outlet in the Kelowna area. This second outlet is, we feel, the only sound answer to freedom of choice in radio programmes in the Okanagan Valley.

This brief is signed by Mrs. R.T. Graham, President, Kelowna Arts Council. Would you like me to read the appendix?

THE CHAIRMAN: You can if you like. I

think it amounts to a series of letters and exchange of correspondence between your Council and various offices of the C.B.C., and I took it, in reading it, that there had been many requests but no answers to your suggestion as yet. Is that a fair summary of your position?

MISS CROSSLEY: Yes, exactly.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't think there is much more to add than that, but if there is anything you would like to add to the actual brief itself, Miss Crossley, we would be glad to have it.

MISS CROSSLEY: I don't think that there is anything to add. The number of entries in the music festival last weekend in Vernon in the Okanagan was 2500. I just felt that figure might be interesting.

THE CHAIRMAN; Have you some questions, Mr. Coyne?

MR. COYNE: Yes, Mr. Chaurman.

I wonder if you would tell us briefly, Miss Crossley, about the Kelowna Arts Council, who it consists of and how it was established, and what its work is? I just want it in a brief way.

MISS CROSSLEY: The Kelowna Arts Council was formed in 1949 as a result of the Massey Commission on Arts, Letters and Sciences to act as a vehicle if and when a Canada Council should be formed. The members of the Kelowna Arts Council are the local Little Theatre, the Okanagan Valley Music Festival Association, the Registered Music Teachers' Association, and individuals representing various unorganized art

groups, and writers and painters in the Kelowna area.

MR. COYNE: It is really a Council of Associations, so to speak?

MISS CROSSLEY: Yes, a clearing house for them.

MR. COYNE: I gather from your brief that CKOV is a privately-owned station?

MISS CROSSLEY: Privately-owned C.B.C. basic station.

MR. COYNE: My next question is: I understand that it is a basic station in the C.B.C. Trans-Canada network?

MISS CROSSLEY: Yes, it is.

MR. COYNE: And you point out that it carries 27 hours of C.B.C. programmes?

MISS CROSSLEY: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Is your suggestion or what the Council has in mind that there should be a larger number of hours of C.B.C. programmes available in the Okanagan than there is to CKOV?

MISS CROSSLEY: Yes, a larger number of hours available.

MR. COYNE: The point I am making is this, that CKOV, although privately-owned is a basic station under the C.B.C. Trans-Canada network?

MISS CROSSLEY: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Now is your feeling that you are not getting enough of the C.B.C. Trans-Canada network?

MISS CROSSLEY: Exactly.

MR. COYNE: That is, the private station, although it is a member of the network, does not carry sufficient of the network programmes available to it?

MISS CROSSLEY: No, I think it carries all it is required to carry, and actually I think it carries more. I think it is required to carry 20 and carries perhaps 27 or 30 hours.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you happen to know what the availability total in hours is on this basic network system? In other word, they carry 27 hours. How much could they carry if everything were offered?

MR. COYNE: We have heard that in Ottawa it was on the network 16 hours a day weekdays and 15 hours on Sunday.

MR. KEDDY: 111 hours per week.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there are 111 hours per week available to CKOV, and they carry 27 in fact, and are compelled to carry 20, is that the summary?

MISS CROSSLEY: I believe that is the picture, yes.

MR. COYNE: And what you are really suggesting, Miss Crossley, is that the C.B.C. should establish a station in the Okanagan Valley of its own?

MISS CROSSLEY: Ultimately, yes. I think that the remnants of the Okanagan booster station is located in the Kelowna area, and that is what they have asked for in this letter for the last six years. The radius of a booster station is approximately 10 miles, and the nearest booster

station is, I believe, at Oliver in the South Okanagan, which is 60 miles south of us.

MR. COYNE: 60 miles?

MISS CROSSLEY: Yes, which is not much use today.

MR. COYNE: Is CKOV the only radio station you can receive in Kelowna?

MISS CROSSLEY: It is the only radio station that can be received satisfactorily. There are two more in the Valley, at Vernon and Penticton, and those are both Trans-Canada stations.

MR. COYNE: The same as CKOV?

MISS CROSSLEY: No, I am sorry; Dominion, but neither of these stations are clear all the time. In the summertime it is very difficult. In the daytime it is very difficult to get either of them.

MR. COYNE: What about CBU Vancouver?

MISS CROSSLEY: CBU Vancouver is only available to a very small percentage of people in our area with high-powered sets, or in an advantageous position, geographically, high in the hills, and there are very few of us who live high enough who can bring it in.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just one other question. If there is this long-standing and apparently fairly substantial local demand for more programming do you know the reason why CKOV only carries 27 out of 111 hours available?

MISS CROSSLEY: I would assume that if they carried any less -- they are a money-making

concern, and in order to keep their advertisers happy they must appeal to the largest portion of their audience most of the hours of the day and it is just sad and rather the feeling of the Council that the intelligence of CKOV's audience is rather underrated, and we felt by having a C.B.C. outfit we would have a better choice. We would be able to turn off a program which we didn't wish to listen to, and tune in to the C.B.C. programmes which we did wish to listen to.

THE CHAIRMAN: You realize, of course, this would involve extra costs?

MISS CROSSLEY: Yes, I do.

THE CHAIRMAN; And this is one of our problems?

MISS CROSSLEY: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Just one last question. Do you infer that if there was a choice that might result? What effect would that have upon the programming of the existing private stations, the fact that someone in Kelowna would switch over to something else rather than turn off the set? Do you think it would improve the programming on the existing station if there is that competition?

MISS CROSSLEY: I think there is rather a limit to which a private station can improve its programmes. It involves expense.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Miss Crossley, for coming down to present this brief to us. We will consider it.

---A short recess.

SUBMISSION OF RADIO STATION CKWX, VANCOUVER.

APPEARANCES:

Mr. F.H. Elphicke.

Mr. S.G. Ross.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have one other brief scheduled for this afternoon, Station CKWX of Vancouver. Mr. Elphicke, you are going to present the brief and you have Mr. S.G. Ross with you?

MR. ELPHICKE: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will start by marking your brief as Exhibit No. 72.

EXHIBIT NO. 72: Brief by CKWX, Vancouver.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you please present it?

MR. ELPHICKE: Yes, Mr. Chairman; if I may just present portions of our brief, as you will know there are pages of it that really don't need to be read this afternoon, and then I will finish up with a final statement before the questioning.

Mr. Ross and myself are representing station CKWX, a private commercial station in this city.

Gentlemen, CKWX Radio Ltd., Vancouver, welcomes this opportunity to submit the story of CKWX and some opinions which we hope will assist in considering the important issues referred to you.

There are five divisions to this brief:

1. Endorsation of the brief submitted by the Canadian Association of Radio and

Television Broadcasters.

2. The history and growth of CKWX in radio.

3. Efforts of CKWX Radio to enter the television field.

4. The place of CKWX in the community, emphasizing

(a) Study classes.

(b) Safety campaigns.

(c) Parliament Hill.

(d) General public service activities.

5. Letters of commendation and support of work by CKWX in the public service field.

Endorsation of the brief submitted by the Canadian Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters: As a private broadcasting station interested in future development of the radio industry and member of the Association, we fully endorse the proposals of the Canadian Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters.

The proposals, outlined in the brief, ask for the licensing of non-Government television broadcasting stations in all areas in Canada and a separate regulatory body for administration of radio and television legislation.

It is our sincere hope the Commission will accept the principles and proposals outlined in the brief.

History and growth of CKWX Radio Ltd.: The original station was established in Nanaimo, B.C. in 1923 with call letters CFDC and power of 10

watts. In 1926 the station moved to Vancouver and the call letters became CKWX. In 1928, power was increased to 100 watts; in 1940, to 1,000 watts and in 1947 to its present 5,000 watts. The present President of the Company, Mr. Arthur Holstead, was the only staff member in 1923. Today, the staff totals 57.

As an indication of our faith in radio in the future, we are building new studios in downtown Vancouver at a cost of approximately $400,000. The building is for radio use only and we hope to occupy the premises by July 1.

Efforts of CKWX Radio to enter the television field: Our first notice of intention to enter the television field was given May 8, 1944, in a letter to the Department of Transport. For the record, here is a summary of communications since that time.

Mr. Chairman, if I have your permission, I don't think I need read these. Since May 8th, 1944 up to and including April 25th, 1955 we have been in almost continuous correspondence with the Department of Transport regarding television. In other words, we wanted to keep it fresh in their minds that we were very definitely interested in television.

In preparation for entering the telvision field, we purchased property in Burnaby Municipality in June, 1951, and tentative approval of the site was given our consulting engineer, Keith MacKinnon, Ottawa, by the Department of Transport.

Negotiations are in progress for a

transmitter site on the North Shore and/or in Burnaby Municipality.

A television company also has been incorporated as it is our intention, if granted a license, to operate radio and television separately in all respects and in competition with each other.

It is also our intention to make formal application for a television license immediately applications become acceptable to the Department of Transport.

Our place in the community: (a) Study classes and practical experience in training prospective employees conducted in conjunction with the University Radio Society (University of British Columbia):

The URS-CKWX radio classes is our major continuing effort in the field of education.

It was started in 1950 by our Production Department to give students at the University of British Columbia an opportunity to learn about radio while taking regular courses at the University.

The course also was designed to encourage young men and women to enter radio broadcasting as a career, and to give the students a foundation that would make it possible for them to get their starting job.

CKWX department heads acted as instructors and lectures also were given by other authorities such as representatives of advertising agencies, producers and others.

Lectures covered such activities as news

reporting and editing, commercial writing, control room operation, announcing and music selection, sales, and administration.

The course has been given each year since 1950-51 and the sixth course has just been completed. Each course involved one night a week for 17 weeks, divided into two sections with one section prior to Christmas and one section after Christmas. Examinations at the end of the first section weed out the unlikely prospects.

During the six years the course has been operating, 135 students have graduated. This year's class totals 25 and the graduation dinner and presentation of certificates takes place April 20. This year, as in several years past, the certificates and graduation address will be given by Dean Geoffrey Andrew, Executive Assistant to the President of the University of British Columbia.

When we submitted our brief, Mr. Chairman, we didn't know that Mr. Andrew was going to be here this morning.

Graduates of the course can be found working in broadcasting stations in Western Canada and others are in commercial work of varying types. Two are on CKWX while two others on CKWX staff were graduates of our previous policy of giving part-time work to university students to assist them in financing their studies. Seven other graduates are employed at present by competitive private stations in the Vancouver area.

(b) Safety campaigns and our program WHY DO THEY DO IT?: Ever since the station was established, we have participated in safety campaigns to reduce traffic accidents, fire hazards, farm and home dangers and industrial safety first drives. The time has been given gratis and has increased in tempo at such seasons of the year as return to school in September, Christmas and New Year holidays, Easter recess and summer school vacations.

One of our major contributions to traffic safety is the program "Why do they do it?". It has been on the air for three years and 137 half-hour programmes have been presented with full co-operation of the Vancouver City Police Department, the Vancouver Police Commission and the Traffic and Safety Council.

At present it is off the air for the summer months but we shall be glad to submit a tape recording of a sample programme if desired.

The programme began in the summer of 1952 when a staff member began to ride the police cars with Police Officers to determine the possibilities in starting an actuality type of programme to reduce traffic accidents and drunken driving.

On the road, one officer carries the tape recorder slung over a shoulder with the microphone in his hand, while the other writes the ticket. Many offenders are aware they are being taped for the programme but many others are unaware. Only the actual conversation between the offender and officer is recorded, with name, address, job, license

number and other identification withheld from broadcast.

The bad side of the driving public is not the only one presented. Traffic officers also follow an apparent good driver for a mile or so. If he conforms with all traffic bylaws, he is pulled over to the curb, license requested and the conversation with the driver recorded. From several such good drivers the best one is selected as the Good Driver of the Week. The driver selected is invited to a luncheon of the Traffic and Safety Council and presented with a scroll.

Authorities agree the programme has been a factor in reducing traffic accidents and a letter from the Vancouver Traffic and Safety Council is appended.

The programme also won the first award in the regional classification for a public affairs programme at the Institute for Education by Radio-Television of Ohio State University in 1954.

A certificate of award also was given in 1954 by the Advertising Association of the West.

(c) Parliament Hill, How's Business and Labour Forum: In 1949 CKWX discussed with representatives of the Vancouver Board of Trade, the Vancouver Labour Council and the Vancouter Trades and Labour Council proposals for a weekly report on business and labour matters.

The programme went on the air in September, 1949, The Board of Trade's programme deals with business

affairs and activities of business organizations under the heading, "How's Business."

Because there were two labour organizations (CCL and AFL) it was agreed each council would take alternate weeks. The programme was named Labour Forum and each spokesman deals with general labour matters and activities of the various unions.

Labour Forum shortly will come under the direction of the single labour council now being organized in view of the merger of the two labour organizations.

Labour Forum is presented at 7.10 p.m. to 7.15 p.m. Tuesdays and How's Business at the same time on Thursdays.

A complementary feature to How's Business and Labour Forum is another 5-minute report at the same hour Mondays and Wednesdays under the heading Parliament Hill. It brings reports from Members of Parliament from the Vancouver area by air expressed recordings from Ottawa on what's going on in Parliament and general public issues of the day. CKWX has carried Parliament Hill since its inception 12 years ago.

(d) General public service: General public service by CKWX is extensive and includes all major campaigns for funds by such organizations as the Red Cross, Community Chest and Canada Savings Bonds and also smaller local campaigns and programmes.

Records are available for study by the

Commission if desired.

5. Letters of commendation: At the suggestion of CKWX, several letters have been received regarding the work of CKWX in the public service field. They are addressed to the Fowler Commission on Broadcasting because we wanted the Commission to know that the writers realized their letters would be appended to this brief.

In addition to these invited letters, we have selected several from our general files to show samples of the many received at the station each year.

Conclusion: We hope the record of CKWX Radio Ltd., as submitted, will put emphasis on the services and value of private broadcasting stations across Canada, and will also support effectively the brief submitted by the Canadian Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters.

We are convinced a separate regulatory body will open the way for expanded activities of the private radio stations in network programming so that the good community jobs of today can be extended provincially, regionally and nationally.

We also hope the door will be opened for competitive television across Canada.

At present, CBUT, Vancouver, is the only Canadian television outlet competing with five other signals from American stations in the Vancouver area.

The American stations are one in Bellingham

two in Seattle and two in Tacoma although all five are not picked up effectively in all parts of the Vancouver area.

The Bellingham station has been estimated to receive between $300,000 and $400,000 annually in advertising revenue from the Vancouver area and Canadian accounts.

We are convinced competitive Canadian television will bring about increased viewing of Canadian station programmes by Canadians much more rapidly than the present system of "take it or leave it" offerings of Canadian programmes through a single Canadian station in each area.

Competition, we are convinced, brings about improvement of programmes and services and competition cannot be fully effective where single stations only are licensed for Canadian service and where network operations are restricted by existing regulations.

We again express appreciation of the opportunity to submit this brief.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

If I may, Mr. Chairman, be permitted one or two observations: In the Vancouver area, which I believe is familiar to some members of your Commission and may be new to others, the Vancouver area includes North and West Vancouver, the City of Vancouver, Burnaby and New Westminster. My friends from New Westminster may not appreciate this, but we are referring to it now as the metropolitan area. In the metropolitan area there are six radio stations,

CKLG in North Vancouver, CJOR, a Dominion network station, CFUN, an independent station, CKWX, independent, with a small affiliation, CBU, the Corporation's own Trans-Canada network station, and CKNW in New Westminster. I personally feel that Vancouver is fortunate in having this number of stations because I think I can say with all sincerity that all the stations have taken their job seriously and have said, "Here is a multiple operation; we should not all be doing the same thing." I think I can say that with all due sincerity, but I don't know one operator in this area who has not got one boss and one boss only, and that is the listener. True, we have directors and shareholders, but at times, we can be impolite to them and say, "We are not worried about you. We are worried about the listener. If we satisfy the listener, then we will satisfy you."

Programming in this area is also starting to develop community patterns. CBU is doing an excellent joband carries the full national network, that is, the national service, the educational service, the cultural programmes, the large dramatic shows. CJOR is gradually developing its pattern with the Dominion network. Other stations are developing patterns along certain types of music and I would like, if I may, to speak for my own station rather than the other stations because maybe they would like to come before you sometime.

We have what we like to call a family-type of operation. We don't go into any great flights of

symphony or serious drama or educational programmes, and, by the same token, we don't get into too much "rocks", hillbilly or swing. In other words, we are trying to be middle-of-the-road.

When we first started to develop CKWX one of the most important things we found in radio at that time was news. Mr. Ross, who for years and years had been with Canadian Press, came back to us to organize our news department. He has since gone far beyond that. Now he runs the station while I run away. Our news has developed today to this situation where we have a news editor and director and six reporters and a sports director. I believe we were one of the first stations in Canada to start building a good news department. I believe we have got one of the largest in Canada, and to give you some idea of how that operates, we have Canadian Press full-time; we have BUP full-time, but we go beyond that because with six men in the city it must be obvious they have leg work and foot work to do. The result is that all major centres of news, like the City Hall and police stations in the town are covered greatly. In addition to that I think I can say without offending anybody that we were the first station to realize the importance of news from our Provincial Legislature.

(Page

Mr. Ross was the first man to work in the Provincial Legislature in Victoria and was responsible for radio men being accepted as members of the Press Gallery, and I think I can say most of the radio men in the lower part of the mainland are members of the Gallery and cover the Legislature each spring. Like most other stations, if we have a story we go to a certain amount of expense. I know I have questioned telephone bills at the end of the month and questioned calls from Buenos Aires and Yugoslavia. I think at one time they were after Mr. Tito but they did not get through to him but to some of the embassies. Recently, now the story can be told even to my competitive stations sitting around here, we had a police inquiry that lasted quite a few months. We knew the ex-chief of police was in California, we wanted to get a story, we wanted, if possible, to get it on tape; so we dispatched a man to California to interview him. We got an interview but we have yet to get the tape. Other than what any private station will try to do in serving this area, I think I can/say without fear of contradiction that you have more activity in this area and have as good a news job as anywhere else in Canada.

Next, we have a fairly strong religious idea because the United Church of Canada was in radio in 1939, it took over two other stations of the United Church of Canada, had a very lengthy contract with this station. It has gone now beyond the contract stage, we have got down to where we are living

together, the service is supplied and the United Church of Canada uses approximately 5 hours a week on the station and I am happy to say that they have become so interested in this work that they have recently appointed a religious director.

Following that further on, we thought then that the area was not just city, as you gentlemen know, it is mostly metropolitan but in the Fraser Valley it is the bread basket of this area; but we thought we should have a Farm Director, and a lot of people thought we were crazy when we appointed a Farm Director. But we figured there were approximately 150,000 people in this land. We tried to get a graduate of the University of British Columbia but we finished up with a graduate of the University of Alberta and, frankly, when he appeared to apply for the job I did not know what to question him about because I know nothing about farming. So he was sent out to the University here and he was interviewed and we are satisfied with him, and the Federation of Agrilcuture are happy and it is this man's job to cover the whole Fraser Valley, Vancouver Island, where there is a lot of farming. This man goes to meetings of farm organizations each week, reporting them. He is out in the country taping interviews with farmers; if one man has a certain way of doing a certain job he passes that information on to the other farmers over that area. He attends every livestock show around here and every year we send him down to the Royal Winter Fair in Toronto for

one reason -- not that we want to send people around like that, but we feel that he should be the best informed farmer in this territory. He has been visiting individual farmers in the Valley and if he knows what went on at the Royal Winter Fair he can go back and talk to his potential listeners in a much more informed manner. In addition, there are cattle exhibitors go from this area to the Royal Winter Fair and if they have any comments they are taped and sent back here. I do not want to labour these things too long, I am trying to show the development of an independent station and it applies to all. A Women's Director, it is true she only does 40 minutes on the air, but it is true that 40 minutes takes some time to prepare. She is around in women's organizations all the time trying to get their viewpoints on various things and get them on the air. Music is not a thing that is lightly handled; during some discussions I am afraid you may be apt to get the idea that music, because it is recorded music -- and let us not forget the fact that the finest music in the world is on records -- is something that somebody goes haphazardly to the rack and puts on the turntable. Music is one of those things that is very, very carefully selected, at least on our station. We carry daytime soap operas, sure we do -- we find a large number of people like them. We carry daytime music programmes in addition to these other features and we carry a certain amount of drama at night because we have an affiliation with the Mutual Broadcasting

System and we carry a fair amount of drama at night. We have sponsored a garden programme, I only hope you gentlemen have time to wander around this city and see the development in gardening, it is a popular pastime. We have a gardening programme and it is sponsored five nights a week. That is the set-up in the City of Vancouver, and in setting it up I do not want you to think we think we are something special or out-of-the-way because we are not. You will find every station in Vancouver doing a very excellent job in its own particular field. I say that of CBU just as much as for the private stations here. Thank you, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think I speak for the whole Commission here when I say it is very desirable for us to get a picture of a local station which could not be done by the Association brief which was following quite a different point, but as we move around the country I hope we will get the kind of picture you have endeavoured to give us on your operations. It has been very interesting and I think we will have a number of questions to ask you. Mr. Coyne?

MR. COYNE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Turning, Mr. Elphicke, on your first point, and I will try and go through your brief as you presented it -- your first point is the endorsement of the brief submitted by the CARTB, and as you point out on page 2, this brief had two main submissions to make, one with respect to the licensing

of television broadcasting stations and with a separate regulatory board for administration of radio and television. Now, I would like to ask you what effect, in your opinion, the establishment of a separate regulatory board would have upon the development of community service by the Canadian radio stations such as you have been describing to us just now?

MR. ELPHICKE: Mr. Coyne, a separate regulatory board does not have to do too much with the community services but it has a lot to do with the individual stations. May I, for the sake of argument, I believe the CARTB brief -- we are supporting the evidence presented to the Commission which I am sure you have had so much material on, I think it was supported by 28 or 30 or something like that -- our idea on what a separate regulatory board might be, we have referred to it -- it was actually, it was a draft Act, we had it prepared by a legal firm and was submitted to the Cabinet. This visualizes a board of five men having everything to do with electronics. The feeling of the Association, I do not want to get away from your question, but the electronic field is growing so rapidly in radio, in television, in ship-to-shore, in taxi radios, in truck radios, radios to air stations and so forth, that we visualized a board that would assume all those responsibilities and the regulation of all those responsibilities. Now, it has always been my feeling and I think I can go back to 1939 on this, that

while I have never experienced, with one exception, any distressing negotiations with C.B.C., I have always had the feeling that it is regrettable they are put in this position; they are a competitor of mine and they regulate me. I do not think in a country like Canada it is a very fair thing to do.

(Page

MR. COYNE: Mr. Elphicke, would you tell us something about the nature of the relations that you have with the C.B.C. where they are, in effect, acting as a regulator of your business?

MR. ELPHICKE: Must I tell the one experience that I had? It is rather old.

MR. COYNE: I don't know. All I am asking for is that we have been told that the C.B.C. regulates the private station as well as operates a broadcasting system of its own.

MR. ELPHICKE: You know the Published Regulations under which we operate.

MR. COYNE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Those regulations apply to the C.B.C. stations as well as the private stations.

MR. ELPHICKE: Oh yes, equally, and let me be perfectly honest and fair that, personally, I have been on committees that have made representations to the C.B.C. about certain regulations we didn't like, and they would not see eye to eye with that, but over a period of time we got some of those regulations repealed.

Mr. Bowman mentioned one of price; the increase in the number of spot announcements allowed and so forth, but I must go back, to answer your question satisfactorily, to an unfortunate incident, but please don't think I hold any enmity or recrimination about it. In 1943, shortly after I had come to the station and we were trying to struggle uphill, Mr. Weir who was then Commercial Manager of the

C.B.C., came to me in November of that year and said, "Look, the C.B.C. is forming a Dominion network. Why do you think your station should be included in the network?" Naturally I thought it would be a good idea to be part of a network. Things were not as good as they have been in the succeeding years. So, I went all out to sell my station. At the end of December of that year I received a letter from Mr. Weir advising me that I had become the member station of the Dominion network.. This resulted in a fair amount of publicity, and it resulted in newspaper advertisements locally. Everybody knew that we were going to be the Dominion network station. Then I started to hear rumours that one of the other stations here -- and I don't blame them at all because the other stations had been carrying all subsidiary network programmes and it must have been a bit of a shock when they found I got the network -- I heard rumours that they were trying to get the network back from me. There was a Board meeting in January of that year and I, with the President, attended that Board meeting and tried once again to put in our pitch. We did so and I hung around Ottawa for days and went to see the late Dr. Friedman who was then Acting General Manager and I was advised on instructions from the Board I had been taken off the network. This was a very serious blow to me because only 30 or 45 days before I have been advertising the fact that I was the network affiliate in Vancouver. It was going to hurt me here pretty badly

and also with the advertising agencies. I didn't know what I had done and I was never given a reason. It is true Dr. Friedman did say to me, "When will it be convenient for you to get off?", and I said March 31st -- "Give me 3 months". I want to be equally fair, because later that year, in August or September of that year, I went back to the Board of Governors of the C.B.C. and asked for an affiliation with Donlea Mutual, which was granted. However, when you go through an experience like that in the struggling days when you are trying to build up a station, it shakes you pretty deeply.

MR. COYNE: Well, admitting that for the moment, but supposing instead of a C.B.C. Board of Governors you had been before some other board which was administering these network arrangements; why would you have anticipated receiving any different result from one board than from another?

MR. ELPHICKE: The result might possibly be no different, but I think I would accept it with a little better grace because the network had come to me to try to get me on and get my story, and then it was taken away without any reason.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. Coyne is asking, looking at this story, what element of competition with the C.B.C. or conflict of interests between their competition and their regulatory powers is contained in that experience of yours?

MR. ELPHICKE: Just this, Mr. Chairman, that I was dealing with the network and also with the

regulator and I wasn't given any particular reason as to why I was being put off. I visualize this happening in the United States, or had it happened with a commercial network. I would have been put on and I would have signed a contract. There was no contract, and I think there is still not with the C.B.C. I think the close proximity of the two, the operating body and the regulating body, is not good, not fair. It left suspicions and doubts in my mind. I am just as well off now; I am the man who got the long straw. I gambled once and had the short straw, and I am not going to gamble again. I have still got the long straw.

THE CHAIRMAN: This was not a case of the C.B.C. getting an advantage of the change that took place; this was the case of another private station getting the Dominion network as against you?

MR. ELPHICKE: But the C.B.C. were the arbitrators, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: But I am trying to get this in my head.

MR. ELPHICKE: I wish I could get it out, myself, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Where is there this conflict that you talk about between operations and regulations?

MR. ELPHICKE: There was operation and practical regulation all put in at once.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I can easily understand your worry and concern if this had been a case of a C.B.C. station or the main body acquiring something at your expense, but this was merely a case of something

which you thought you had going to some other private station?

MR. ELPHICKE: Oh, no; I had been told I had by letter; I had been told very definitely that.

MR. COYNE: Don't you really mean that if you had been in the United States where a contract had been signed, you would have had a right of action in damages against the network?

MR. ELPHICKE: Yes.

MR. COYNE: And perhaps it is unfortunate that the C.B.C. does not write contracts in connection with network arrangements where those similar rights would be available, but you would not suggest that in the United States, for example, the matter of network affiliations is something that is referred to an independent board which exercises its judgment over the matter of affiliations?

MR. ELPHICKE: No, definitely not, but I believe this very sincerely, that if a station has any particular complaint about a network, they can then go to the Federal Communications Commission with their story, because the Federal Communications Commission are studying that sort of thing; they are studying right now, to my knowledge, on television where some of the small stations are complaining about network affiliations, and I was talking of the same people.

MR. COYNE: The present regulations as they exist today, do you have any specific recommendations as to how those regulations should be changed or as to the amendment or deletion of any of these

provisions of the Broadcasting Act, or are you arguing merely in terms of a shift of the jurisdiction from the C.B.C. Board of Governors to some independent board?

MR. ELPHICKE: I am asking for a shift of the handling or the direction, yes. To be realistic, I think if such a shift took place that the present regulations will become the basis of some new body. Over a period of time I suppose they will change and I will also say in my own humble opinion that quite a few of the regulations are not necessary. Mr. Bowman quoted one here. I don't think any regulation on spot announcements is necessary. I think the listener will regulate you on that. I haven't suffered too badly at the hands of the regulation.

MR. COYNE: Why do you say on page 9, "We are convinced a separate regulatory body will open the way for expanded activities of the private radio stations in network programming ..."?

MR. ELPHICKE: Because I think there will be a greater hearing, and they will feel more comfortable in approaching the matter of regional networks than they have up to now.

MR. COYNE: Why?

MR. ELPHICKE: Because it was the feeling there was no use going. I have heard the statement made that private radio has never applied for networks. May I refer now to the Parliamentary Committee -- this started in 1939 -- but may I refer to the Parliamentary Committee of 1944 when Mr. Joseph Sedgwick

was then appearing before the Committee for private radio. It is only about half a page and I will read it, and he says:

"I now to the last regular department "of my presentation and that deals with the "establishment by the Corporation of the "second or Dominion network. During the "course of his evidence before this Com- "mittee, Dr. Morin dealt with the estab- "lishment of the C.B.C. of the new Dominion "network, and he said that it was designed "to bring the benefit of network affilia- "tion to stations formerly not affiliated "with any network, and also to provide "for Canadian listeners, alternate pro- "grams. In commencing with the part of "his presentation which dealt with this "subject, Dr. Morin referred to a memoran- "dum which in March, 1939, the Canadian "Association of Broadcasters presented "to the Board of Governors suggesting "the set-up of a second national network. "On reading his evidence, it seemed to me "that Dr. Morin left the impression with "this committee that the C.A.B. proposal "was that the Corporation itself should "establish and operate such a network. "The fact, I think, is otherwise. The "March, 1939, meeting between the Board "of Governors and representatives of the

"C.A.B. was held with Mr. L.W. Brockington,
"the chairman of the Board, presiding. Far
"from suggesting that the C.B.C. should
"operate the two networks, the suggestion
"of the private broadcasting interests
"was, as the suggestion is now, that they
"should be given permission to form and
"operate a second network which would bring
"to the people the benefit of alternative
"programs and would improve broadcasting in
"Canada by providing the C.B.C. network with
"healthy and fair competition."

(Page

It goes on a little further but that is the gist of the thing. In 1939 I think I was on the Board of the Association and in 1944 it actually came before the Parliamentary Committee.

MR. COYNE: Let us take it this way, Mr. Elphicke: Presumably if a separate regulatory body was established it would be charged with the administration of regulations affecting radio and television in the public interest. Now, would you agree that the C.B. C. at the present moment is charged with the operation of a national broadcasting system in / the public interest?

MR. ELPHICKE: Oh yes, certainly.

MR. COYNE: Now, why do you suggest in your brief that the separate regulatory body would come to any different interpretation of what is or is not public interest than the Board of Governors of the C.B.C.?

MR. ELPHICKE: Because I am suggesting the close proximity to the actual work of broadcasting, Mr. Coyne, is naturally bound to -- and this is human, I am not criticizing them -- is naturally bound to give them some sort of bias.

MR. COYNE: What kind of bias?

MR. ELPHICKE: Against possibly the formation of other networks. If I am ready to go to a separate regulatory board, I want a regional network for this Province, I go to the separate regulatory board and make my representation, realizing that the C.B.C. will be there, and if they do not like my

proposal they will oppose it; but at least I will have the feeling that I dealt with somebody who was not actually operating a network and with whom I might compete.

MR. COYNE: Even if the result is exactly the same and not satisfactory to your own interests?

MR. ELPHICKE: Even if the result is exactly the same, I have been to an impartial tribunal.

THE CHAIRMAN: You said a moment ago in dealing with a body that is in close touch with broadcasting.

MR. ELPHICKE: Is a broadcasting body.

THE CHAIRMAN: I see, you put it in close touch with broadcasting and I was going to ask you if a regulatory board would not be close too?

MR. ELPHICKE: Well, actually, it is broadcasting in Canada.

MR. COYNE: Why do you say or imply here that if there was a separate regulatory board in effect the private network broadcasting would develop?

MR. ELPHICKE: I think it would.

MR. COYNE: Why?

MR. ELPHICKE: Because I think networks would develop ---

MR. COYNE: Why? Just let me interject, excuse me for interrupting; in other words, you are suggesting that a separate regulatory body would consider private networks to be in the public interest, whereas the Board of Governors of the C.B.C. consider them not to be?

MR. ELPHICKE: No, sir, I am not suggesting that.

MR. COYNE: I fail to follow your argument.

MR. ELPHICKE: I am suggesting what would be in a broadcaster's mind in approaching a separate regulatory board.

MR. COYNE: Well, it is all in the broadcaster's mind, is it?

MR. ELPHICKE: I would say very largely. In the one in 1944 when we got rebuffed, we have tried it other times, but I would say that 120 minds or 140 minds cannot be too far wrong; there are so many minds with the same thinking; this has been turned somewhere and it is a very real feeling, very real. This is not anything against the C.B.C., I just say they are so close to the picture.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do they not have to be close to the picture, whoever is regulating it has to be close.

MR. ELPHICKE: Certainly, but I do not think they have to regulate. If they are operating against me, they are competing with me.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it comes to this: do you feel a separate regulatory body charged with the task of developing broadcasting in the public interest of Canada would be more apt to give you, the private networks, a better deal than the present C.B.C. Board of Governors who are also charged with regulating broadcasting in public interest, and also charged with operating?

MR. ELPHICKE: We are getting everybody

regulating it now. As I visualize it, the separate regulatory board would not be charged with developing broadcasting, the C.B.C. would still be doing that. The regulatory board, as I mentioned to Mr. Coyne earlier, would be the body that regulates the licensing and research on everything to do with the electronic medium, all types of radio, and I think that is in the submission we have made to this Commission as one of the examples; they would be charged with that and that purely. I would appear before the board asking for this particular thing and if the C.B.C. had good reasons why it should not be granted, they would oppose it, but I would feel, having an entirely separate body, that I had got my story to an impartial body.

MR. COYNE: Would they be charged with making regulations to control the stations or networks of stations in Canada?

MR. ELPHICKE: Yes, certainly in this particular case. Of course, I think that regulation is wrong, but I do not see why a network should not be set up. I think there has been great progress in radio.

MR. COYNE: But you think it should be something different than what a board dealing with broadcasting in the public interest might come to a conclusion on?

MR. ELPHICKE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: May I ask you this, it is on the same point; at the same time by section 8, the C.B.C., called the Corporation, is instructed

to carry on a national broadcasting service within Canada, and in the subsequent sub-paragraph I think it is fair to say, it may do this in various ways. Now, on your suggestion of a separate regulatory board, do you envisage that that responsibility would remain with the C.B.C. or would be transferred to the separate regulatory body?

MR. ELPHICKE: The separate regulatory body I visualize and the Act would have to be changed to set up a separate regulatory body, I suppose.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would think so. I just want to see. A moment ago I thought you were saying that you thought that the separate body would be charged merely with the licensing of stations.

MR. ELPHICKE: And all regulations.

THE CHAIRMAN: But who, in your picture of the future, is going to be responsible for the developing of a national broadcasting system?

MR. ELPHICKE: I think the people that have done a job already, the C.B.C.

THE CHAIRMAN: I mean, which as between the C.B.C.?

MR. ELPHICKE: The Corporation will do that under the regulations of the regulating authority of this particular body.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: On the other hand, Mr. Dunton, when he appeared before us in Ottawa, said that the C.B.C. had the responsibility for setting up and producing a national broadcasting system which would bring radio to all parts of the country, which

was done through their stations in co-operation with a number of private stations, and if I remember correctly, he made the point that having the responsibility he could not carry it out unless he had the authority. Now, would you care to express a view on that?

MR. ELPHICKE: Yes, I disagree with that theory. I wish I was a salesman with the C.B.C. and had to sell a package to the N.B.C. or A.B.C., because I could do a good job.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Neither of those two companies is offered the national broadcasting system, the C.B.C. have an entirely different right to operate in Canada as against these networks in the United States.

MR. ELPHICKE: They have a certain number of sustaining programmes, but when he is given a very large number of commercial programmes and to a large number of stations, it was a very attractive package, it was attractive enough to me when I wanted to go on the Dominion but I do not think it has been sold.

MR. COYNE: What about the question of network affiliation, if the C. B.C. should be charged with providing the national broadcasting service and in order to do so it must utilize the facilities of some private stations, and presumably it is necessary for somebody in some cases to force certain private stations and not other private stations to carry these services; how do you envisage that compulsion, if you like, being exercised?

MR. ELPHICKE: I don't know what change would have to be made in the Act, but I would say in that case there would have to be something in the Act that gave the separate regulatory body the power to do that. This, I take it, will be the single station market?

MR. COYNE: Well, not necessarily. It is conceivable that even in a larger area none of the available private stations would want to be affiliated with the C.B.C. network.

MR. ELPHICKE: Could be conceivable in radio today, but not quite so conceivable as television. The radio is not what it used to be.

MR. COYNE: If I understand you correctly, you are suggesting that in developing this network for the purposes with which the Act charges them, that the C.B.C. should have to go to the separate regulatory body to make its network arrangements?

MR. ELPHICKE: No, no, I didn't say that. They would try, naturally, to make their own network arrangements. They would have a Station Relations

Department, not Station Relations and Regulations. The Station Relations Department, he is going out and working; he has got a basic package, and, after all, we are all selling something. In the majority of cases he would be able to go and sell that basic package. Now, we will say he goes to a city that has three stations and he cannot get one of them to go along. A hearing would have to be called and the separate regulatory body would have to have power to make a decision. Frankly, I hadn't thought of that question until you asked me, but it is the only way I see out of it.

MR. COYNE: They would, in effect, order one of the three stations to become affiliated with the network?

MR. ELPHICKE: That is the only way I can see at the moment.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Would you care to offer any opinion on the suggestion that was made this morning by Dean Andrew -- I think you were here this morning?

MR. ELPHICKE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: I will read you what he had to say:

"In our opinion therefore a single Board "of Governors of Canadian radio and tele- "vision broadcasting should be maintained "on its present basis of regional repre- "sentation, and for most, if not all, of "its present purposes. The single change

"we would suggest considering is that the
"present Board of Governors might be tied
"less closely to the Canadian Broadcasting
"Corporation operationally, this for the
"purpose of making it more apparent than it
"currently is, that the Board of Governors
"is in a position to ensure that standards
"in broadcasting and television are maintain-
"ed both by the national system and by the
"private outlets."

MR. ELPHICKE: May I say to that that three or four of us discussed this at lunchtime and we haven't had time to discuss it fully, but it was a most interesting suggestion.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Would you rather reserve judgment on it?

MR. ELPHICKE: I would rather.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we are reserving judgment too, but on an occasion like this we would like any help you or anybody else can give us on this kind of suggestion, but looking at it from your own personal point of view and without trying to press you on this does that meet some of the psychological problem you were talking about a moment ago, or does it seem to?

MR. ELPHICKE: May I say it could, but I would like to take a further look at it, and I am not trying to be evasive.

MR. COYNE: Turning to CKWX's efforts to enter the television field, on page 4 you refer to the fact that the television company has been

incorporated?

MR. ELPHICKE: Yes, sir.

MR. COYNE: I wonder if you could indicate whether you have developed any definite plans as to the programming which you would anticipate carrying on a T.V. station?

MR. ELPHICKE: Finally, no; but certain preliminary plans, yes.

MR. COYNE: Do you anticipate receiving any C.B.C. programmes?

MR. ELPHICKE: No, sir. May I put it this way, that we would be perfectly prepared and happy to start a television station without any C.B.C. programmes or help or assistance at all. If, on the other hand, after our facility was going they thought we had a value, we would naturally be more than happy to sit down and discuss the matter with them.

MR. COYNE: If you knew from the outset that you were to have no C.B.C. programmes, that would not deter you?

MR. ELPHICKE: Oh, not in the slightest.

MR. COYNE: In those circumstances, and in the absence of any C.B.C. programming, could you tell us in general terms the sort of programming which you would anticipate putting on your T.V. station if a license were granted?

MR. ELPHICKE: Yes, and I say that this is very sketchy, because we have had little encouragement so far, so it is all in paper notes in the file. I would imagine there would be approximately

60% of it film and 40% of it local, give or take 5 or 10% -- no, no, certainly local would not go down 5 or 10%. In your local programming, in a local community, there are certain basic things such as newscasts, there is your home programme, your cooking programme, there is your interview programme, there is your gardening programme; we would do quite a lot in sports; we would certainly use our farm editor; we would certainly use a garden man; we have had a talent group on the air now for five or six years every day one hour daily, a talent group which is popular and country style of music and they appear on the networks not infrequently. That would be part of the show. We would try and be Vancouver and the Lower Mainland. In other words, anything of interest going on locally, we will be there. Please don't get me wrong, but this is no criticism of the existing television station, because they have got national commitments and many of them, and they can't get in and do as big a job as we can do on the local picture, and if they will give me a chance to join the national network we will develop nationally too.

MR. COYNE: What about your film programmes?

MR. ELPHICKE: What do you mean -- what about them?

MR. COYNE: Where will they originate?

MR. ELPHICKE: From the accepted producers where C.B.C. buy their films, and I suggest that the majority comes from the United States, and a fair amount of feature film from J. Arthur Rank in the

Old Country; when I say "feature film" I mean hour-and-a-half shows they run at night. I don't think we will be different from anybody else in the film picture.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you as an independent separate station be able to afford a feature film which is now purchased for a whole network by the C.B.C.?

MR. ELPHICKE: It is competitive but it has been done and is being done. I know the station in Windsor is competing very strongly with Detroit, and this is possibly one of the very tough American markets. When the boys go to sell them film they look upon the Windsor station as a Detroit station, and it is the Detroit rates you pay, but I also know in the film industry the more you bargain the better you do.

THE CHAIRMAN: Of course, the Windsor station is now part of the C.B.C. national network.

MR. ELPHICKE: Oh, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: And is getting 50% of the programming.

MR. ELPHICKE: I don't think it gets as much as the other stations because of it being under the American network stations.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you just, following up this line of questioning, this is a departure in policy from what has taken place up to now which you are suggesting,the licensing of private television stations -- would you think that -- naturally it has to be a general rule for different places, it cannot just be one rule for Vancouver -- would you think it would be appropriate for some kind of programme regulation to be imposed as part of the granting of the license or by regulation on the operations of the station?

MR. ELPHICKE: Can you give me an idea what the regulation is?

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, let us for the sake of argument, suppose they said that you must produce 40%, take your own figure, of Canadian-produced live shows.

MR. ELPHICKE: I said, give or take 5%, yes, I would not object to that. Certainly I would take a license under that. And I would say, Mr. Chairman, I hope if this is a new departure, this suggestion, I hope it catches on across Canada because I think it is something that should be done. I agree with Mr. Goode, what he said this morning in spots; I do not agree with everything he said.

THE CHAIRMAN: If I might ask one further question, I would like a little clarification on this: Apparently there is one other channel available on the lower mainland in this area.

MR. ELPHICKE: To my knowledge there are two, 8 and 10 I think are available.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that is correct. In some places there are not any and in some places there is only one; it is a varied sort of thing. In his brief this morning Mr. Goode said that he could guarantee at least four radio stations operating now in British Columbia are interested in building a private television station in Burnaby as soon as a license if permitted. I take it yours is an individual application?

MR. ELPHICKE: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: I suppose you would say that in the event of such a policy being adopted, it would be a matter of choosing between the four applicants or the six applicants or however many there are as to their merits and qualifications for getting this license?

MR. ELPHICKE: I think that could be true. I think also it is true that circumstances do make strange bedfellows at times, it may be possible that two would get together, but I would be prepared to go on our record of service.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Elphicke, just turning for a moment to your present programming over CKWX, can you give us very roughly the breakdown in categories of your present programming in terms of local, live and sustaining, commercial, etc.?

MR. ELPHICKE: It just so happens I have the breakdown here that we submitted to the C.B.C. about six weeks ago; local live talent programmes, 3 hours and 55 minutes; community activities ---

MR. COYNE: Community activites?

MR. ELPHICKE: Yes, community activities, talks and discussions broadcast, the total there was 6 hours and 45 minutes broken down in this way, and I think I should read it to you; the commercial was 1 hour and 25 minutes; there were 2 hours and 35 minutes ---

MR. COYNE: I am afraid you are going too fast, I would like to take all the details.

MR. ELPHICKE: I will willingly have a copy of this made for you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us get the broad breakdown.

MR. ELPHICKE: Agricultural and fisheries -- there are no fisheries, that is chiefly agriculture, 4 hours and 30 minutes; sports broadcasts, 5 hours and 43 minutes; news, 19 hours and 25 minutes; quiz or contest programmes, 8 hours; other programmes, and the definition of that includes programmes which do not fit within categories, 74 hours and 5 minutes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any music on the station?

MR. ELPHICKE: That is in the other programmes obviously.

THE CHAIRMAN: Or it may be local live talent?

MR. ELPHICKE: The local live talent, there is certainly more music than that.

MR. COYNE: Well now, apart from the 74 hours and apart from some recorded programmes that

you mentioned in your talks and discussions, are all those other categories local live talent?

MR. ELPHICKE: Not all.

MR. COYNE: I am sorry, all these other categories, are they all non-recorded programmes?

MR. ELPHICKE: Most of them; you mean outside of the 74 hours?

MR. COYNE: Yes?

MR. ELPHICKE: Most of them; there are some, like some of our religious programmes and so forth, we find that people do not like to go to studios at night any more.

MR. COYNE: And a proportion of your local live programmes are sustaining as against commercial?

MR. ELPHICKE: Yes, 26 hours in that week, a total of 43 hours and 30 minutes.

MR. COYNE: Of what?

MR. ELPHICKE: Of local live that week, 17 hours and 30 minutes of which was commercial and 26 hours of which was sustaining.

THE CHAIRMAN: May I get that last figure again?

MR. ELPHICKE: Yes, sir; a total of local live during the week, the week ending January 1st, the total of local live was 43 hours and 30 minutes, the commercial was 17 hours and 30 minutes and the sustaining was 26 hours.

MR. COYNE: When you say sustaining in these categories, do you mean that the time has not been purchased for commercial purposes?

MR. ELPHICKE: Yes.

MR. COYNE: What about spot announcements?

MR. ELPHICKE: In one case only would there be spot announcements and that is in the Rythm Pal show in the afternoon, certainly not in the talks and discussions, certainly not in the religious programmes or the cultural programmes or the sports broadcasts.

THE CHAIRMAN: I was just going to ask you would it inconvenience you if we asked you to come back in the morning? We have had a long day and there may be a few more questions, and certainly I am getting a little confused with this breakdown.

MR. ELPHICKE: So am I. I view with alarm the thought of leaving people to think about what I have said, but I will be happy to come back tomorrow.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

We will adjourn now until 10.00 o'clock in the morning.

---The Commission adjourned at 5.15 P.M.

I N D E X

SUBMISSION OF:		Page
TOM GOODE, M.P.	Individual brief	1540
UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA TELEVISION COMMITTEE		1585
Dean G.C. Andrew Dean A.W. Matthews Dr. Marion B. Smith Mr. Norman Barton		
BRITISH COLUMBIA PARENT-TEACHER FEDERATION		1625
Mrs. W.W. McDonald Mrs. A.H. Young Mrs. A.F. Cliff		
STATION CKLG, NORTH VANCOUVER		1634
Mr. R.T. Bowman, Manager		
KELOWNA ARTS COUNCIL		1678
Miss Linsey Crossley		
STATION CKWX, VANCOUVER		1685
Mr. F.G. Elphicke, Vice-President and General Manager		

INDEX TO EXHIBITS

No.	Description	Page
67	Brief by Mr. Tom Goode, M.P.	1540
68	Brief of University of British Columbia Television Committee	1585
69	Brief of British Columbia Parent-Teacher Federation	1625
70	Brief of CKLG, North Vancouver	1634
71	Brief submitted by Kelowna Arts Council	1678
72	Brief of CKEX, Vancouver	1685

ROYAL COMMISSION

ON

BROADCASTING

HEARINGS

HELD AT

VANCOUVER, B.C. MAY 15, 1956

V. 11

ROYAL COMMISSION ON BROADCASTING

Vancouver, B.C.,
May 15, 1956.

PRESENT:

THE CHAIRMAN	ROBERT M. FOWLER
COMMISSIONER	EDMOND TURCOTTE
COMMISSIONER	JAMES STEWART

COMMISSION COUNSEL	JAMES M. COYNE A.J. deGRANDPRE

SECRETARY	PAUL PELLETIER

SUBMISSIONS BY:

STATION CKWX, VANCOUVER (Cont'd)
Mr. F.H. Elphicke, Vice President and General Manager.
Mr. S.G. Ross, Assistant Manager.

GROUP OF CITIZENS FROM NANAIMO
Mr. W.R. Taggart, Librarian

VANCOUVER SYMPHONY SOCIETY
Mr. Robert Phillips, Business Manager

B.C. ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS
Mr. Maurice Finnerty
Mr. C.J. Rudd
Mr. Elphicke
Mr. Seabrook

FEDERATION OF LABOUR
Mr. Geo. E. Home, Secretary-treasurer
Mr. Bob Smeal, Vice-President

MR. DON PARTRIDGE — Individual brief

OVERTURE ARTISTS AND MANAGEMENT
Mr. George Zukerman.

VANCOUVER, B.C
May 15th, 1956.

SUBMISSION OF RADIO STATION CKWX (Cont'd) 10:00 a.m.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will get started again. We did not quite finish last night, Mr.Elphicke. Mr. Coyne, would you like to go on with your questioning? I think you were at the point of trying to get a breakdown for time on CKWX?

MR. COYNE: That is right. Mr. Elphicke was giving us some figures as to the programmes which CKWX carried in a particular week, I think it was in January.

MR. ELPHICKE: The week ending January 21.

MR. COYNE: I wonder if you could give us those figures again, Mr. Elphicke. It was a little difficult to get them down last evening.

MR. ELPHICKE: Yes sir, and I will go slowly. Local live talent programmes; local live sustaining 3 hours 55 minutes; community activities sustaining 1 hour' talks and discussion broadcasts 6 hours and 45 minutes. Now, Mr. Coyne, would you like me to break that down into commercial live,sustaining live,recorded and so forth?

MR. COYNE: If you can do it conveniently.

MR. ELPHICKE: Yes. Talks and discussion broadcasts, commercial live, 1 hour 25 minutes; sustaining live 2 hours and 35 minutes; recorded commercial 1 hour; recorded sustaining 30 minutes.

MR. COYNE: That makes up the six hours and forty-five minutes?

MR. ELPHICKE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: The last network commercial was?

MR. ELPHICKE: One hour and fifteen minutes. Religious broadcasts, local sustaining four hours and forty-seven minutes; recorded commercial one hour and twenty-five minutes.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Just a minute, that last one, was that local religious commercial?

MR. ELPHICKE: Local live sustaining and recorded commercial.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: On a religious programme?

MR. ELPHICKE: Yes, there are certain religious programmes that pay for time so they are classified as commercial. I mean, there is no sponsorship but the actual church or denomination pays for the time so we class it as commercial, one hour and twenty-five minutes and network commercial for a total in a week of seven hours and twelve minutes. Agricultural and Fisheries broadcast, this is strictly agricultural, it is only headed Agricultural and Fisheries, local live commercial two hours; local live sustaining two hours and thirty minutes for a total of four hours and thirty minutes. Sports broadcasts, local live commercial two hours; local live sustaining three hours and forty-three minutes.

MR. COYNE: Three hours?

MR. ELPHICKE: And 43 minutes. The odd time there would be a hockey game, at this time of the year we were broadcasting hockey for a total of four hours and thirty-five minutes for the week. News, local live

commercial 11 hours and 40 minutes; local live sustaining seven hours and thirty minutes; network sustaining fifteen minutes for a total of nineteen hours and twenty-five minutes. Quiz or contest programmes, local live commercial, 25 minutes; recorded commercial five hours and five minutes; recorded sustaining two hours and thirty minutes for a total of eight hours. Other programmes, recorded commercial, fourteen hours and fifty-five minutes; sustaining fifty-five hours and thirty minutes; network sustaining three hours and forty minutes for seventy-four hours and five minutes, a total in the week of 130 hours and 35 minutes.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is the total?

MR. ELPHICKE: On the last classification 74 hours and 5 minutes. The weekly total for that week was 130 hours and 35 minutes of service.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would the 55 minutes of sustaining other programmes be recorded?

MR. ELPHICKE: Yes, 55 hours and 55 minutes is recorded.

THE CHAIRMAN: So that practically all of those 74 hours is recorded?

MR. ELPHICKE: Oh yes, three hours and fifty-four minutes of network sustaining.

MR. COYNE: And Mr. Elphicke, the 70 hours, could you give us an idea as to what that transcription is, is it in fact largely recorded music?

MR. ELPHICKE: Largely recorded music. Unfortunately, I was not able to get the figures for

you, I was kind of excited last night when I left and the staff had gone and I was not around there this morning but I am having that figure brought down for you. I took some checks and I would suggest it is slightly better than 50 hours of music but I will get the exact figure for you. The other is made up of transcribed dramas and things of that nature.

MR. COYNE: Would the so-called soap operas be in that?

MR. ELPHICKE: Yes.

MR. COYNE: And when you say, when you distinguish between recorded commercial 14 hours and 55 minutes and recorded sustaining 55 hours and 30 minutes, you mean by the term "sustaining" that the time is not purchased?

MR. ELPHICKE: The whole period of time is not purchased but undoubtedly there will be spot announcements in there.

MR. COYNE: Now, there is a formula and if I might ask you to ask Mr. Keddy what the formula is, because I do not know, but there are so many announcements and so many variations in an hour and that is checked out on a sustaining basis. Have you any figures you could give us with regard to your spots during the week?

MR. ELPHICKE: The number of spots?

MR. COYNE: Yes?

MR. ELPHICKE: Yes, I think commercial including time and weather 901.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is 901 individual spots?

MR. ELPHICKE: Yes, spots and flashes, non-commercial time and weather announcements, that is 678 non-commercial, community service announcements 103.

MR. COYNE: Now, when you say time and weather do you mean that 579 of those spots had to do with time and weather?

MR. ELPHICKE: No, you are taking the first two together and that is commercial including time and weather, there are certain weather forecasts that are sponsored, you see, in an operation such as ours we give the time pretty frequently especially in the morning hours and also the weather.

MR. COYNE: I misunderstood your figure, you said commercial time and weather 901, you mean, including time and weather?

MR. ELPHICKE: Yes, that is the commercial including time and weather there.

MR. COYNE: That is, all your commercial spots total 901?

MR. ELPHICKE: Yes.

MR. COYNE: And then, is the same true of your news commercial, 678?

MR. ELPHICKE: Yes, it shows the non-commercial too, it is made up of non-commercial time and weather announcements, that includes non-commercial time and weather chiefly.

MR. COYNE: Could you explain what a non-commercial time and weather announcement is?

MR. ELPHICKE: Yes, that is an error committed by the Sales Department because it is not sponsored, it has no sponsorship at all, it is put out by the station but it is available for such in many cases providing we do not overstep the bounds of the number of spots we are allowed.

MR. COYNE: That is, your announcer announces the time and weather as the case may be and if there is a commercial message with that it goes in the 901?

MR. ELPHICKE: That is right.

MR. COYNE: And if there is none it goes in the 678?

MR. ELPHICKE: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Could you give us any idea as to what proportion of spots not at all commercial are time and weather spots?

MR. ELPHICKE: Quite frankly, I cannot. Again, I can get that information for you. As I said, I am taking it from the proof of performance form that we file with the CBC on request for a certain week, we do not know what week it is going to be, suddenly the form comes to the office and they say: "Give us a report of your performance for this particular week". They have copies of our logs, they are sent down weekly and they can check it with the logs.

MR. COYNE: Would you say in these non-commercial spots numbering 678 that the major propor-

tion of those would be time and weather announcements?

MR. ELPHICKE: Oh, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: May I ask one question more generally, instead of this breakdown, is this simple unknown week the only check of your programmes that, as far as you know, the CBC does?

MR. ELPHICKE: No sir, because each week we send in a complete log of the week's operation, every station has a log of everything on the air and it must be identified in the log daily and a copy of that is made out for the CBC and forwarded each week, and I am sure they are checked because I have been checked once or twice.

THE CHAIRMAN: As far as you know, does the CBC monitor any stations?

MR. ELPHICKE: I have heard rumours but I do not know.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Elphicke, turning now to a subject that arises out of something we were discussing yesterday and related to the argument about the independent regulatory board, the submissions in favour of an independent board are usually based on the proposition that the CBC and the private stations are in competition with one another.

MR. ELPHICKE: Yes, very definitely.

MR. COYNE: I wonder if you would outline for us your views as to how, in fact, at the present time the CBC and the private stations compete with one another and I think you might take radio first of all and then television?

MR. ELPHICKE: Television I will do my best with Mr. Coyne, because I am not, unfortunately, engaged in the business yet; but radio certainly, and I think it is in three major areas. One is competition for audience. When I mention the fact that they are competing with us, I am not complaining. As a free enterpriser, I think competition is healthy and does us good and keeps us on our toes.

Secondly, they are definitely in competition with us for national business. It has been said, and I believe it is true, that in radio CBC do not compete in the local field in Vancouver.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Well, don't confine it to Vancouver.

MR. ELPHICKE: Well, I beg your pardon; all over the country. They do compete for national business

in trying to get that business on the network, but at the same time I am trying to get that business. I have representatives in Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg and Vancouver all trying to secure the national business for me.

MR. COYNE: When you say "national business" you mean some manufacturer or commercial firm who is not in business in Vancouver or who is advertising on a nationwide basis?

MR. ELPHICKE: Yes, people like General Foods, and all the similar people. They are naturally out trying to sell the network. Not having the facilities of the network, I am trying to get it on spot time.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you are actually offering different commodities. You are offering local spot time or conceivably a local programme, and the CBC is offering a network programme.

MR. ELPHICKE: In many cases, the firms have their own programmes. In most cases the basic commodity we are selling is time. Many of the national accounts for instance, take Proctor & Gamble, we carry daily -- and this is open to correction -- but as far as I remember, something like 1 hour 15 minutes or 1½ hours for Proctor & Gamble daily. One half hour is a show they have had with us for 14 years called "Red, White and Blue" but we also sell three-quarters of an hour a day with their own shows on transcription. So, we compete for time. In that time they buy time for 15 minutes across the country; they buy times more convenient to them, but they are still covering the country.

MR. COYNE: You mentioned three areas?

MR. ELPHICKE: Yes, the third is this- and again I am not complaining - but under the Act, the way it is, I suppose it should be, but basically the CBC have a choice of frequencies, they being the body that recommends, after the Department of Transport has processed it, whether a licence should be granted or not, or a frequency changed,and the power of the station. For many years in this country the private stations were held down to one thousand watts, and it was quite a struggle to get 5,000 watts. That happened in 1945 or 1946. They have, I think it must be agreed, the choice frequencies. They haven't got them all because they are not operating enough stations. I am not complaining about this, but I would like to see it coming back to a separate regulatory body, because if I thought a certain frequency would be more beneficial for my operation here, and my consulting engineer said that this frequency was available, I would say, "Okay, prepare the necessary engineering on that because I am going to make an application", and I would feel happier if I sent it to a separate regulatory board knowing full well if the CBC had a use for it they would appear and oppose my application, and I am sure, if it was in the public interest, they would get it and I would not get it.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: The only instance that has been brought before us was St. John's, Newfoundland, where the CBC competed or bid for a frequency against a local station, and the local station

got the channel rather than CBC. That is the only instance which has been brought to our attention, which would seem to indicate, at least, that the Minister of Transport, who actually issues the licences, has an independent view despite the recommendation?

MR. ELPHICKE: I think that is true. May I say this, Mr. Chairman, that there are two instances coming before you later on this morning and I would hate to take something out of somebody else's brief, where something different has been done.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. Stewart's point is that on the Statute itself the questions of frequency and power and licensing are to be decided by the Minister of Transport, and we have had at least one instance - and we may get some on the other side - but we have had one instance at least in which there was an application by a private station and an application by the CBC, and the private station got the channel.

MR. ELPHICKE: That is correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: Which seems to perhaps throw a little question around your statement that the CBC has a choice of frequencies and power. Would you not agree with that?

MR. ELPHICKE: No sir, because of the two instances I know that are coming before you this morning.

If I could give you one other, and again I have no complaint about it: some few years ago CBU in Vancouver moved from 1130 kilocycles to 690 kilocycles.

1130 was supposedly a CBC frequency. As soon as the move came we had to consult an engineer in Ottawa to draw up a brief for us for 1130, which was submitted to the Department of Transport. We were advised, and rightly so, that this frequency was still being reserved for the CBC.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: There was an instance came before us in Ottawa on the change of frequency, and CBC in Toronto changed from 740, or something like that, or from some other station, and one of the private stations had to move. There again, as I understood it, that station had been reserved for government use from away back. Whether the private station who had the use of that channel had been advised of that at the start, that there may be a change later on, I don't know. That is something we will have to look into, but apparently that also was reserved for some time back.

THE CHAIRMAN: You said you were told in this instance here in Vancouver that this had been reserved for the CBC?

MR. ELPHICKE: It was still held in reserve.

THE CHAIRMAN: Surely the question is, if it is reserved or held, by whom?

MR. ELPHICKE: I would imagine at the request of the CBC.

THE CHAIRMAN: Perhaps, but the actual effect, you will surely agree, on the Statute is that it is the Department of Transport - Mr. Keddy, do you know about this reservation?

MR. KEDDY: Yes sir, the Department of Transport assigned 1130 as one of the clear channels for use in British Columbia to the CBC. As Mr.Elphicke has explained, we discovered another clear channel, 690 in Montreal could serve the listeners of British Columbia better than 1130, it is a better channel and you get better service and this change was made some two or three years ago, I cannot be exact as to the date on it, but the Corporation, when this change was made, asked the Department whether the frequency could be used elsewhere in British Columbia and the Department of Transport said that frequency was assigned to Canada to be used in British Columbia and in the interval the Board has rented out its use in several places, including the one you heard reference about yesterday. It is a clear channel that requires a minimum power of 10,000 watts and again from memory, my understanding

of the cost was of the order between $100,000. and $200,000. to pay a station to hold that frequency as a clear channel and in operating costs of upwards of $50,000.00 a year. The Board in this period has been unable to see revenues coming in for this and as recently as this last May it has turned the frequency back to the Department of Transport saying that it cannot find the revenues to use it itself.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the point of these questions is simply your submission that the CBC has the choice of frequency and power?

MR. ELPHICKE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am not arguing but I am pointing out the original question was as to whether they were competing, and I was trying to show, there is an idea there were three, I might have taken it down wrongly?

MR. ELPHICKE: No, it is a third one in answer to Mr. Coyne's question.

MR. COYNE: If I understand your point, it was that the CBC because it is operating a public broadcast is more likely to be awarded the power channels and the more powerful channels than private competitors?

MR. ELPHICKE: Yes.

MR.COYNE: Mr. Elphicke, you in your brief support the principle that private stations should be able to form networks both regional and national; if there were private national network in radio, would

you contemplate that the CBC network and the private network would compete for business?

MR. ELPHICKE: Oh, very decidedly, very definitely.

MR. COYNE: Would not the fact that the CBC is a non-commercial corporation and is supported with public funds make your competitive position with them an extremely difficult one?

MR. ELPHICKE: It would, I would personally prefer to see them - this is a personal expression of opinion only - without commercial revenues if they are going to get into that sort of thing but I have no fear of competing.

I mean, we would be competing with a network that was going out after national business and also have a subsidy whereas we would have to get all our revenue from the business we sold, I would sooner see it another way but I have no fear of competition.

MR. COYNE: Would it not mean that the CBC would get any programme that it wanted?

MR. ELPHICKE: No sir, not in my opinion.

MR. COYNE: It could not because they would not be competing in a commercial sense, they do not have to, there would be no requirement, it would not be intelligent for them to compete in a commercial sense.

MR. ELPHICKE: And you say they would get the commercial programmes?

MR. COYNE: Any programme they went out to get?

MR. ELPHICKE: I say no, definitely no, because I think a private station would render far more community service and I am not being unkind, I think our sales department would be more aggressive, I think we would originate business. Network business has sunk very badly in this country and the United States and I see reasons in both countries for it, television has been the big competition, but I imagine every witness that has been before you has said that daytime in radio is good but at night-time is not so good.

Now, aggressive selling, there is business to be had locally in this city which is just not being sold, I made --

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there network business to be had in the city?

MR. ELPHICKE: Yes, we could originate business if we had a network I am sure here, and there have been network programmes from Vancouver, commercial network programmes.

THE CHAIRMAN: You were talking about business to be had in the city.

MR. ELPHICKE: Local business, yes, but there are certain network accounts that have rejected radio in this city on CBC commercial accounts, I made the statement that I think radio network had dropped off very badly in the United States which it has done and I blame the networks completely for it, NBC and ABC; why, because they put radio and television to-

gether and this is a big new glamour medium. Everybody wanted to get into television, everybody started to lose their enthusiasm for radio but radio today is still one of the finest advertising mediums in the world and the lowest priced, we can beat anybody.

MR. COYNE: You can beat them in price, but how about the audience against the CBC?

MR. ELPHICKE: In the day time, any time, but in the night time it is tougher.

THE CHAIRMAN: I hope you will not misinterpret this, but you are trying to put radio and television together here in Vancouver.

MR. ELPHICKE: Not together, sir. The new building is strictly for radio. When television comes it will be six miles out on the Kingsway and both sales department will have a clean set of sharp, new knives, if I happen to be general manager, I want to see blood on both sides.

THE CHAIRMAN: CBS and NBC have done the same thing in the States.

MR. ELPHICKE: Yes, but they did not, they combined the two and that is why I am grateful.

THE CHAIRMAN: That was not the impression I got of the way they were operating when I was looking into it in the States.

MR. ELPHICKE: Recently?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. ELPHICKE: Oh yes, the change is starting now but at the beginning it very definitely was.

THE CHAIRMAN: A combined operation?

MR. ELPHICKE: Yes, a combined operation and the glamour medium was getting all the attention. I suppose that is reasonable because they had more money invested in it.

MR. COYNE: I think that is all the questions I have.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have only one other question. On page 9 of your brief you say:

> "We are convinced a separate regulatory body will open the way for expanded activities of private radio stations in network programming so that the good community jobs of today can be extended provincially, regionally and nationally."

I know Mr. Coyne asked you some questions early in his examination yesterday and I have no specific question but have you any explanation of that statement and if so, we would like to get your full contention.

MR. ELPHICKE: Yes, there are times of the year when certain campaigns are on, community work, certain campaigns hit the province and every local station does a job and we, being in a major city, in that market have certain visitors who are speakers on this particular subject and --

THE CHAIRMAN: Just a minute, what I am

asking you is, how would a separate regulatory body open the way for that?

MR. ELPHICKE: Here is my own personal feeling, as I said earlier, I am trying to be as sincere as possible because I have nothing to gain otherwise, with the CBC controls of regulation, in my opinion, it is not fair.

Now, with the separate regulatory board, I would feel this; they are not engaged --

THE CHAIRMAN: You say it is not fair, not fair in principle or not fair in practice?

MR. ELPHICKE: Oh, in principle, definitely.

MR.COYNE: And not fair to the public or not fair to the private broadcaster?

MR. ELPHICKE: No, I don't think it is fair to the public because I think, as I have expressed here, the development would have been far greater had we had two people competing trying to build up networks.

THE CHAIRMAN: I interrupted you, but I wanted to be clear as to what you meant by "not fair".

MR. ELPHICKE: Oh, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I was asking you how you felt, according to your written brief, that a separate regulatory board would open the way for the kind of community service you mention?

MR. ELPHICKE: Yes. My own feeling is this, that with CBC, while I haven't tried after my Dominion network experience years ago, my own feeling is that they are likely to be biased in favour of their own system. I am biased in favour of my own, but I try to be fair.

If I go out to get a network on a one-time basis, if I want the right of setting up a net work in this province, I would start off very humbly - maybe for half an hour a day, and I have got problems with stations because many of them are under CBC contract, so I have to select my times very carefully. I know I have a half-hour period I can develop, and I have the feeling that if I went to a separate regulatory body, to gentlemen who are not connected with

broadcasting, but with all the wisdom in the world, they would be able to take this thing without any bias, and I would appear and make my pitch.

If the CBC didn't think it was in their interests or in the public interests that I should have it, they would appear and oppose me, and I know the gentlemen are not on one side or the other -- and if you are not on one side or the other when you are in business, then you are stupid -- I would know at least there would be no claim to bias.

THE CHAIRMAN: On this specific point I am only trying to get the meaning. Does this paragraph really mean. "We are conviced a separate regulatory body is likely to give us network privileges, and thereby will open the way for expanded activities in private radio stations"?

MR. ELPHICKE: We are convinced that it will.

THE CHAIRMAN: That it is likely?

MR. ELPHICKE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think I get your point. If you didn't get the network privileges out of the separate regulatory body, then the body would not enable you to expand your activities.

MR. ELPHICKE: Obviously I could not get out and expand.

If you haven't another question, may I go on to a question that was raised yesterday. A question was asked yesterday of Mr. Goode as to the

Vancouver sponsors on KVOS - TV in Bellingham, and Mr. Goode said he thought it was getting up to $90,000 a month. We think it is between $300,000 and $400,000 a year. I have a list of these sponsors and I would like to read them.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, if you have the list we will file it.

---EXHIBIT No. 73: List of Vancouver Sponsors on KVOS-TV Bellingham.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is a list of Canadian sponsors on Bellingham Station?

MR. ELPHICKE: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: You maintain that the private operators could run a national network and apparently make it pay, because, after all, that is what we are all in business for, and give a better service to the public or give as good a service, at least. In his submission yesterday, Dean Andrew said one national system of network, French and English is all, apparently, that Canadian economy can justify at the present time, and he goes further and says: "But we cannot see how the CARTB is in competition nationally, nor or we convinced that the economy could afford to compete in national systems, if both of them undertook to foster Canadian national identity and further Canadian unity by their programming." If I recall correctly, when Mr. Dunton was before us in Ottawa, he said that had he to go out and compete in real competition with anybody, and if

part of his job was to make money, he knew how he could do it and CBC could make money. If both these statements can be taken as read, then it would seem that the objective of furthering the national economy, the national unity, the national heritage would suffer. Have you got anything to say on that?

MR. ELPHICKE: No sir. I don't see how it would suffer, but first of all, I did not say in my brief that a national network immediately ---

COMMISSIONER STEWART: No, no; but in the course of talking back and forth this morning, you intimated that a national network by private stations could ultimately be made to pay.

MR. ELPHICKE: Oh, it could ultimately, yes sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Here is a statement, with a certain amount of reserve I would imagine, that the economy of the country could not hold up two competitive national systems and still maintain the objective for which the CBC was set up; that is, for the inculcation or development of national unity and national programming and national culture.

MR. ELPHICKE: I think, personally, it would make it grow, because if you start off in provinces, or regions with regional networks you could eventually build that network up, bearing in mind it must get its funds from commercials,and you will gradually build up to a national network, and certainly this commercial network is not going to be all advertising. There are

people of responsibility in broadcasting in Canada, the same as the United States, and they recognize that responsibility. If you have two networks competing, sure, if the CBC network was doing an opera or a symphony, you would then possibly be doing some light entertainment; you would balance against the other network and I think it is going to give dissemination to more ideas between east and west.

THE CHAIRMAN: But I think Dean Andrew here was saying that he doubted very much that there would be sufficient advertising to support two competing national networks.

MR. ELPHICKE: I am sorry, I have to disagree with Dean Andrew and agree with Mr. Dunton. It is starting to work good and I think it is there if someone has the incentive and digs for it.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: But you would disagree then with what Mr. Duncan was saying that the objective set out by the Government when they set up the CBC might be destroyed in that we would not be furthering national unity and culture or whatever it was?

MR. ELPHICKE: No, I think we are going further, the CBC network would still be there.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Yes, but they would have to confine their programmes to the needs of the advertiser in order to get the money to make it possible.

MR. ELPHICKE: What are they going to do with the subsidy?

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Then there would be no subsidy.

MR. ELPHICKE: Oh well, then we would be something like the networks in the United States and I think you must agree ---

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Where the making of money would be the main objective and the reasons for the incorporation of the CBC would go out the window.

MR. ELPHICKE: not
May I say, making money is/the main thing, serving is the main thing in my opinion, because I do not know of any business where you have to serve people more than in radio broadcasting and I imagine in television, if you do not serve people you do not get listeners and if you do not get listeners you have nothing to sell.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Yes, but you have two competing systems both selling time to the advertisers, the public has no option but to listen to those

advertisers, well, there is a difference of opinion naturally as to whether the advertising is too much or too little or too good for the country or too bad for the country and I judge, from people who have been before us, the fact is that we should have too little rather than too much advertising.

MR. ELPHICKE: There is a certain section of people who object to advertising, I would say the great majority does not object. Then,may I say this, that I do not --

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you say the great majority does not object to it?

MR. ELPHICKE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Some of the very largest groups represented before us objected very vigorously.

MR. ELPHICKE: Mr. Fowler, I know this is true but I wonder when I talk to some of these members of these groups, how many of them were aware of the brief that was presented for them, I mean, the actual members.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Well, we can only take what is presented to us, and that is what has been presented to us.

THE CHAIRMAN: And in one case which we had yesterday, a very detailed questionnaire went to 47,000 people in this province.

MR. ELPHICKE: I have quite a few questionnaires too, but when you talk about these groups, when we live in this community and talk to people, and we

all do talk to people, the Kiwanis club, I am a member of the Rotary Club, we have a staff that is into practically every organization in this city, now, I admit certain organizations' surveys represent a certain section of people but we are in these organizations and have a fairly good idea what is going on.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: To get back to the original question, I take it it is your view that two actively competing national systems, you believe that the economy of this country is sufficiently big to provide both with profit?

MR. ELPHICKE: I think it could. I am saying that when it comes to the private stations they must be given a chance to start, they will start off with a few hours daily but they will gradually grow.

THE CHAIRMAN: And you think, to continue the question, from the way you gave the answer, that they could then, these two competing systems could make a profit and not have a decline in the quality of programme?

MR. ELPHICKE: Who is to define quality, that is what I am trying to find out, because what happened in the United States? It was the National Broadcasting Company who gave Toscanini the Symphony; it was the ABC that went out and got the Opera on the air and sold it to Texaco. I do not think we have had that experience with competing networks, they can see that the job is pretty shoddy.

THE CHAIRMAN: Of course, you must admit there is 160,000,000 in the States.

MR. ELPHICKE: Oh yes, we won't be competing 16 hours a day either.

MR. COYNE: I just wanted to ask Mr. Elphicke if he had ever applied to the CBC to operate a regional network in British Columbia.

MR. ELPHICKE: Never; I told you yesterday, Mr. Coyne, that I have never applied.

MR. COYNE: Well, if a regional network in British Columbia is a practicable proposition, why has no application been made?

MR. ELPHICKE: Because the concensus of opinion among the broadcasters is that you have not a hope of getting it, we feel, what is the use.

MR. COYNE: Are you familiar with the network in Quebec?

MR. ELPHICKE: To a small degree.

MR. COYNE: We still have to find out something about it because we have not held hearings in that area but it has been represented to us that there is in fact in existence in the province of Quebec and has been for some years, a private commercial regional network.

MR. ELPHICKE: I am not too conversant with it, I realize they have a problem there.

MR. COYNE: Why would you feel that if the CBC is prepared to authorize a private commercial regional network in Quebec that they would not be prepared to authorize a similar type of network in British Columbia?

MR. ELPHICKE: Because I have always been told that in Quebec they had many problems in connection with broadcasting.

MR. COYNE: But no-one, as far as you know, has in fact ever applied for a licence?

MR. ELPHICKE: They have applied on a few occasions for a special programme but for a network on the regular basis, no. I am almost encouraged.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do not take either encouragement or discouragement out of any of our questions.

MR. ELPHICKE: If I cannot look upward and forward and be in Canada, what is the use of living?

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, it was most valuable to us to have your views expressed as you have done on behalf of your station in particular and to private broadcasters in general. We appreciate your coming and taking the trouble to help us.

THE CHAIRMAN: The first brief to be heard this morning was to be from a group of Nanaimo citizens to be presented by Mr. Taggart, but we have had a message that his ship has been delayed and he won't be here until later. We will, therefore, proceed with the next brief.

SUBMISSION OF VANCOUVER SYMPHONY SOCIETY

APPEARANCES:

Mr. Robert Philips.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will begin by marking your brief which you have submitted as Exhibit No. 74.

EXHIBIT NO. 74: Brief of Vancouver Symphony Society.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you proceed to present your brief?

MR. PHILIPS: Thank you. I have very little to add to what has been submitted.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think actually, while we have had it and read it, it is a very short brief and probably the easiest thing would be to have you read it.

MR. PHILIPS: Certainly.

This submission is presented on behalf of the Vancouver Symphony Society, and is based largely on expressions of views obtained from members of

the concert audiences.

The Symphony Orchestra is currently playing in full houses of over 2,800 and, in its 26th consecutive year, is possibly more mature than at any other time.

In our view, the standard of production, variety and number of musical events by both the C.B.C. radio and T.V. are highly commendable, and in answers to enquiries we have made there is nothing but praise for what has been accomplished. Moreover, it is suggested that the development of audiences who appreciate good music is largely due to the quality and quantity of programmes produced by the C.B.C. This is reflected in improvements in the fortunes of musical societies, such as the Vancouver Symphony, whose very existence depends upon a steadily increasing audience.

The writer has discussed this subject with other organizations in this city and has confirmation that the increasing development of interest in "live" performances undoubtedly stems from the work of the C.B.C., where frequently works which were unfamiliar to the general public have become comparatively well known. In addition, the network service to the remoter areas of British Columbia has made a link with the life of the metropolis which is important to both.

The development of interest in making music, as distinct from listening, has been encouraged by radio listening and later in the concert

hall. It has been observed that in many cases adults have been drawn towards a new interest in music owing to the enthusiasm of their children to learn an instrument: children who have, in fact, been stimulated by radio and T.V. programmes, supplemented often by the Vancouver Symphony Society's Youth Concerts.

One can only assume that if the C.B.C. can continue its present policy, we can reasonably hope that in a generation or so we will have a community that is neither embarrassed nor isolated by the "long hair" attitude to the Arts, and to music in particular; an attitude which, at the present time, suggests a sense of inferiority owing to a lack of opportunities in the formative years of childhood or adolescence.

Lastly, it is the C.B.C. radio and T.V. performances, and the C.B.C. sustaining fees paid to the Symphony Society that enable musicians in Western Canada to add earnings to those derived from the Symphony Society. Without the benefit to the musicians of these joint earnings, undoubtedly most of the professional musicians could not remain in this area and would drift away to other locations, leaving Greater Vancouver with a very low standard of performer. This, in turn, would have its attendant effect on not only orchestral performances, but also on developments in the standard of musical performances for ballet, drama, opera and, most important of all, teaching, where clearly the highest possible standards must be encouraged and maintained.

In conclusion, this subject has elicited considerable discussion amongst concert-goers and there seems to be no doubt that it is the opinion of all seriously-minded people that, if the C.B.C. failed to maintain and increase its present quality and quantity of musical performances and ceased to give its financial support to musicians and musical organizations which employ them, the whole impetus of cultural growth would come to a standstill. We would see the "juke box" and the heavily endowed commercial radio programmes triumph over good taste and maturity.

Much has been achieved in this city in recent years to widen the horizon of purpose and interest so as to include facets of our cultural heritage in the daily lives of the people. The C.B.C. has contributed much to this cause and cannot, in our view, do less than continue, unrestricted, in its present course.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Mr. Philips, do you wish to add anything?

MR. PHILIPS: No, I have nothing to add except this, that I don't know how one can emphasize enough that a Symphony Society is greatly dependent on an increasingly mature audience. One has a very small percentage of the average community that is well-informed on this subject, so that the problem of maintaining an organization with a limited proportion of the population interested in a very serious one indeed, and if there is not sufficient

attendance at concerts there is the problem of maintaining a substantially well-developed orchestra, and the tendency would be for musicians to drift out of the town because they would not earn enough. So, earnings are closely related to interest, and interest stems from what the community hears on its radios. I cannot emphasize it enough because I see it every day at concerts, people buying season tickets, and it is largely what they have heard on the radio as to whether they are going to buy tickets or not.

As far as the maintenance of musicians is concerned, if they cannot earn sufficient from the various sources, obviously they cannot be maintained by a Symphony Society alone, because their earnings from concerts would be insufficient to maintain them. This point is important, and I emphasize it.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Mr. Philips, you say in your brief that you have been operating for approximately 26 years?

MR. PHILIPS: Yes.

MR. deGRANDPRE: During those 26 years what is the number of concerts that you give yearly?

MR. PHILIPS: An average of, I should say, about 35 a year; not over the period of 26 years, but in the last 10 years it has been an average of 35 or 40.

MR. deGRANDPRE: 35 or 40 a year?

MR. PHILIPS: Yes.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Are those concerts broadcast by some of the stations, either C.B.C. or

privately-owned stations, in Vancouver?

MR. PHILIPS: In recent years they have only been broadcast on C.B.C., and only 12 of the 35 to 40; that is, the Sunday subscription concerts.

MR. deGRANDPRE: And they were broadcast only by C.B.C.?

MR. PHILIPS: By C.B.C.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Have you been given any time or have you purchased any time on the privately-owned stations in the Vancouver area?

MR. PHILIPS: I haven't got the facts on this because it was before my time, but there was a period when there were commercially-sponsored symphony programmes; about four or five years ago, but I haven't got any facts on this.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Do you mean they were on C.B.C. stations or privately-owned stations?

MR. PHILIPS: I am not sure; I think it was C.B.C. who broadcast it, with a commercial sponsor.

MR. deGRANDPRE: And when the commercial sponsorship was dropped the C.B.C. continued to carry these programmes as sustaining programmes?

MR. PHILIPS: Yes, they have done so for a number of years.

MR. deGRANDPRE: But to your knowledge the symphony concerts were never broadcast by the private stations?

MR. PHILIPS: I think that is correct.

MR. deGRANDPRE: I take it you are the Manager of the orchestra and that in that capacity

you look after the musicians' contracts? Am I correct in this assumption?

MR. PHILIPS: Yes, that is correct.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Could I ask you if under the contract you have to pay the musicians more if there is a broadcasting, or is the same tariff?

MR. PHILIPS: We do not have to pay the extra, but that is a special concession made through some arrangement with the Musicians' Union, but it is a special concession we receive in Vancouver owing to our difficulty in maintaining solvency. I don't know how long we are going to have this privilege.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Have you appeared on television in Vancouver?

MR. PHILIPS: Once or twice -- you mean as an orchestra?

MR. deGRANDPRE: Yes.

MR. PHILIPS: Members of the orchestra have, but the orchestra has not, no.

MR. deGRANDPRE: The orchestra has never appeared on television?

MR. PHILIPS: No.

MR. deGRANDPRE: From your experience when you have viewed symphony concerts on television, what has been your impression? Is it as good a medium as radio, or do you think it is not as good a medium? I am asking you the question because the Winnipeg Symphony Orchestra indicated that in their opinion it was distracting to the viewer.

MR. PHILIPS: Yes. I am not very qualified

to judge. I don't think T.V. adds anything to music. I think it is probably a distraction. It has a certain value to children and people who have never seen an orchestra, but I think as a regular feature of symphony music I imagine it makes a very small contribution; but that is purely a personal opinion.

MR. deGRANDPRE: When your orchestra has appeared on radio could you tell me whether those concerts were for adults only or were they given for children at times?

MR. PHILIPS: The sustained programme, I don't know what kind of listener they are, but to judge from the correspondence it represents a very wide variety of listener; but they are not special programmes for children.

MR. deGRANDPRE: They are not specially designed for or directed to children?

MR. PHILIPS: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have one or two questions. You said something like 12 of your concerts are carried by the C.B.C. stations?

MR. PHILIPS: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you know if they are carried on the national network or not?

MR. PHILIPS: Yes, the Canadian national network.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, and what is the arrangement in connection with those? Does the C.B.C. pay the Symphony Society or pay the musicians, or merely agree to carry the concert for the Society?

MR. PHILIPS: The C.B.C. pays the Society a fixed sustaining fee per concert and they back the whole series.

THE CHAIRMAN: What order of magnitude is that?

MR. PHILIPS: For the 12 concerts the Society receives $15,000 which is, for this year, one-fifth of its revenue.

THE CHAIRMAN: And you pay your own musicians for the concerts?

MR. PHILIPS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you pay the musicians any differently because they are being broadcast than you would pay them on the other 25 concerts?

MR. PHILIPS: No, they are paid an agreed fee for any kind of work they do, whether it is rehearsal or concert, by the C.B.C.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, but you have one concert that is broadcast by the same musicians and another that is not broadcast; do you pay the musicians any differently for the broadcast concert than for the one that is not broadcast?

MR. PHILIPS: No, it is the same fee by a special arrangement with the Musicians' Union.

THE CHAIRMAN: So that you are being supported, then, by the C.B.C. to the tune of $15,000 a year at the present time?

MR. PHILIPS: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any reason that you know of why a private station could not carry

some of those other 25 concerts if it chose to do so?

MR. PHILIPS: The Society loses, in an average season with an expenditure of about $145,000, the Society loses anything from $65,000 to $75,000 -- roughly half of its cost -- that is, after allowing for the sustaining fee from C.B.C. So, its operating loss is $65,000 or $75,000. I don't think the private stations in selling -- I don't think they could make $70,000 out of the remaining concerts.

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh no, I am not suggesting that. I am saying that I can see the C.B.C. may be in a position to make the $15,000 contribution where the private station would not, but you have at the present time some 25 concerts which are not broadcast?

MR. PHILIPS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: And you have made a point in your brief that it was very important to build up public knowledge of music in order to get better understanding of music in the community, and that you have to put it out to them, and that radio is important for this purpose?

MR. PHILIPS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Therefore, I assume it would be more important for you to have 40 concerts broadcast than only 12?

MR. PHILIPS: Certainly.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am asking this -- and it is not my business to suggest the way people do business -- but I find in the one station we have heard from this morning there is 55 hours and 30

minutes of sustaining programmes, most of it recorded music, in a week. Is there any business or technical reason why they could not equally well carry one or other concerts at no cost to themselves, no extra charge, instead of playing records?

MR. PHILIPS: Well, there is no reason that I can see.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would the Society be willing to have it done?

MR. PHILIPS: We would be delighted. The bigger the audience the better. The Society has to use the services of its musicians to the best of its ability to avoid unnecessary loss.

THE CHAIRMAN: But your arrangement with your musicians would not involve you in any additional costs?

MR. PHILIPS: It would in commercial radio.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, I mean in sustaining?

MR. PHILIPS: As far as the 12 subscription concerts are concerned, by special arrangement with the Union no extra amount is paid to the musicians, but I don't know what would happen if one presented it in front of the Union with more work. There may come a point where the Musicians' Union would regard this as an excessive claim on the musician.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, he is playing the same thing whether it is broadcast or not broadcast.

MR. PHILIPS: Well, the ways of the Union are very mysterious.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't know whether you

want to comment on this, Mr. Elphicke?

MR. ELPHICKE: I was making notes to figure out if I had my network how much it would cost per station to make it possible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, apart from that, you have got a station.

MR. ELPHICKE: Well, the only reason that stops me is the $15,000.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, on the assumption there is no payment.

MR. ELPHICKE: No payment for covering symphony? I would be more than happy to talk to Mr. Philips. This is the first time I have heard of it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I am just curious that in your example, Mr. Elphicke, you had a substantial amount of time devoted to the playing of records, as you told us this morning, and here is a live programme of music where they are only broadcasting 12 out of 35 or 40 of the programmes. I am raising the question as to why these two facts cannot be brought to gether.

MR. ELPHICKE: Mr. Chairman, I think you have done a great service to the city.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will leave it to you.

MR. PHILIPS: I need some protection. The point should be made clear that for the orchestra to play one service, which is regarded as either a rehearsal or a concert, costs in musicians' pay $900, so if the orchestra were assembled it would cost $900.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am talking about the actual ---

MR. PHILIPS: Well, the performance in the theatre, or recording ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Or live. It is not beyond the bounds of technical probability when you can do it live.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: When you go on the air with the C.B.C. network what time do you give your concert in Vancouver?

MR. PHILIPS: Last season it was from 3.00 to 4.00.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: On Sundays?

MR. PHILIPS: 4.00 to 5.00, and next season will be from 3.30 to 4.30 P.M.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: You give these concerts on Sundays only?

MR. PHILIPS: Every other Sunday.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: To meet the time differential, suppose you want to broadcast an evening programme and you had to transcribe it so that the rest of Canada would get it at the proper time, would you have to pay your musicians extra for the very fact it would be transcribed instead of going out live?

MR. PHILIPS: This situation does not arise as far as we are concerned. It does go out live, and I don't know what happens if it does not. The programme as far as we are concerned, I think, is broadcast live as far as Toronto.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: That is because you are on in the afternoon; but if you had a 9.00 o'clock programme in Vancouver it wouldn't reach Montreal until 1.00 o'clock in the morning, in which case you would want to transcribe that for the following week: Would you have to pay your musicians extra for the very fact it was transcribed rather than going out live?

MR. PHILIPS: It depends on the whims of the Union.

MR. KEDDY: The broadcast is in the afternoon, but in the East we have delayed privileges on programmes of this kind recorded in Winnipeg, and it is carried in the evening, I think, about 10.00 to 11.00 or 11.00 to 12.00.

THE CHAIRMAN: The C.B.C. handles the time problems in those cases?

MR. KEDDY: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: You told Mr. Turcotte that the ones broadcast were Sunday afternoon concerts?

MR. PHILIPS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: What about the other 25? Were they also Sunday afternoon concerts?

MR. PHILIPS: No, they are various times. They are for children, and out-of-town communities, and public concerts, and so on.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have a concert every Sunday or every second Sunday?

MR. PHILIPS: A subscription concert, every second Sunday, and the other concerts are fitted in

in a 25-week period between October and March.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Philips.

---A short recess.

SUBMISSION BY GROUP OF CITIZENS FROM NANAIMO.

APPEARANCE:

Mr. W.R. Taggart.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you anyone with you, Mr. Taggart:

MR. TAGGART: No, I have not.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will start by marking your brief Exhibit 75.

EXHIBIT NO. 75: Brief submitted by group of citizens from Nanaimo.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not know if you have been here long enough to know how our procedure goes, but we ask the person presenting the brief to either read it or summarize, whichever is the most convenient, and after that we ask questions to bring out various comments and points of view when you are through your presentation. Will you proceed to present it as you think best?

MR. TAGGART: Well, I will present it by

reading some of the more important points in the brief.

This brief is intended to present points in favour of C.B.C. policy, powers and programming in both radio and T.V. It is strongly urged that the status quo be maintained in Canada with regard to all forms of broadcasting. In point 2 of the brief, because broadcasting fulfils the function of a public service, there must be public control of radio and T.V. In a democracy this does not mean State or dictatorial control, but jurisdiction by an appointed representative board selected by the elected representatives of the people. Because of complexity of operation and limitations in station frequencies and channels, the major broadcasting networks should be publicly-controlled for the good of all.

The principle of free and open competition by private enterprise is not valid in this sphere. Also, because the C.B.C. is a public service, its operating costs should be paid for from Consolidated Revenue.

Point 4, the specific aim of broadcasting in general, should be to entertain, to perform, to provide recreation and, in the case of children and younger people at least, to educate. This does not mean constant programming of arty pseudo-culture and narrow regionalism, but with a nation ten times Canada's population adjacent to Canada speaking one of Canada's languages, the danger of recorded, indiscriminate broadcasting is great. A danger is also

seen in the small amount of really Canadian literature seen on the huge reading market. Therefore, a national Canadian network is needed in both radio and T.V.

National networks in French and English also help to unite a bi-cultural, widely-scattered population. Moreover, sparsely-populated, out-of-the way areas which could not be served profitably by private radio can receive by network the carefully produced programmes of the larger cities.

Although it is not the purpose of this brief to make odious comparisons, the facts indicate that the C.B.C. studios in the major cities are large and well-equipped, giving scope for the varied talents of writers, producers, musicians and actors. On the other hand, most of the private stations are small, relying heavily and necessarily on American recordings to fill the broadcast day. They do not seem to be turning profits into improved and enlarged studio facilities. It would seem the C.B.C. is trying much harder to bring programmes with local, provincial and national Canadian flavour and appeal to its hearers. This point is not meant to be anti-American in any way; on the contrary, it is to be wondered what the United States people would think if their radio, T.V. and reading material were largely of Canadian origin.

The charge has been made that the C.B.C. is a monopoly. It has been submitted earlier in this brief that in order to fulfil its functions it

must be a monopoly, but it is a monopoly in public service, owned through tax support by every citizen in the country. No great change in the structure and powers of the C.B.C. should be made without thoroughly informing the public of the issues involved, and having a national vote on the matter.

The C.B.C. is democratic, being directly answerable to Parliament, as is demonstrated by the appointment of this present Royal Commission. Private radio is much more remote from direct control by the people.

In T.V. the C.B.C. has been greatly criticized but it must be remembered that television is still very young in Canada, and Canadian television might eventually surpass the best in American and European T.V. Canada's population is comparatively small; therefore, our resources for extensive development of television are limited, at least temporarily, but with the great predicted growth in wealth and population this situation will change.

With the C.B.C.'s difficult goals of entertainment, wide variety of programming, plus the retainment of Canadian identity, it is obvious that all of the programmes will not please all of the people all of the time.

Here it might be noted that the C.B.C. is trying to be democratic and forward-looking in keeping in mind some of the recommendations of the Massey Royal Commission for the development of Canada in ways other than technical.

T.V., even more than radio, is not a simple business where everyone can jump into the market and by simply having enough money to invest be able to make more money and also provide a good product or service. There are limited channels in television; obviously the Government must control the use or exploitation of these channels for the good of all. When most products are offered on the market, the public is in a position to reject some and choose others. This must always be the case in radio and T.V., but it is feared that if these services were entirely in the hands of private industry there would be a sameness and conformity about them, as is seen in private radio, which would actually mean that the listener had no choice at all.

In short, it is believed that the best interests of the public cannot be served if radio and television are in the hands of private business, any more than schools or the post office should be operated for profits. By its nature, broadcasting is a public service and must be directly controlled through the elected representatives of all the people. If the C.B.C. is ever made an intelligent issue in a national election, and the people clearly vote against it, then and only then should the reduction of C.B.C. powers be considered.

With regard to the financing of television, it is recommended that a Trans-Canada C.B.C. television network be set up and paid for out of Consolidated Revenue. This network should have studios

in the major cities in each Province and booster stations at appropriate points so that as large a portion of the population as possible can receive good reception. Private T.V. stations could then exist side by side with the C.B.C., as in radio, as far as channels and physical conditions will allow. Although public control and management of T.V. would be expensive, Canada's growing population, national individuality and cultural awareness make it imperative that the people of this country received Canadian-produced, non-commercial television service.

The C.B.C. system of the co-existence of public and private service has worked very well in radio; there is every reason to expect that this system will function equally successfully in the field of television.

Finally, all the terms and provisions of the Canadian Broadcasting Act of 1936 should be left in force. The main reason for putting that point in is this, that special reference to Section 21, paragraph 1 of the Broadcasting Act which establishes that the C.B.C. should be the regulatory board for all forms of broadcasting in Canada. It should be noted, however, that private stations although under the control of the C.B.C. in this regard, have access of appeal to the Exchequer Court of Canada if the C.B.C. have failed to fulfil some function which comes under the Act. I will not bother reading Section 21 of the Canadian Broadcasting Act, but I would stress that as a reason why we included

that point 13.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is all you want to say at this point, Mr. Taggart?

MR. TAGGART: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Coyne?

MR. COYNE: Mr. Taggart, you are not representing any organization, I understand?

MR. TAGGART: No, that is right.

MR. COYNE: And did your group just simply get together for the purpose of presenting this brief?

MR. TAGGART: No, not for that purpose, simply for friendly talks and discussion of current affairs, and this happened to be an issue at the moment and we decided to present a brief.

MR. COYNE: None of you are associated with radio or television?

MR. TAGGART: Not one, in any way, no.

MR. COYNE: I would like to go through your brief and raise certain questions with regard to some of the points you have put forward. In point 1, you speak of the stereotyped sameness of some private stations:

" -- although it might give them a larger
"permanent audience, cuts off an appre-
"ciable segment of the population alto-
"gether."

I wonder if you could tell us generally what you mean by the steoeotyped sameness, what you had in mind?

MR. TAGGART: Well, I mean the sort of spot quiz punctuated by recordings of various kinds; there is a 5-minute record and a 5-minute dialing to the housewives on several stations in the area.

MR. COYNE: Do you find a lack of variety in the programming which you receive from private stations?

MR. TAGGART: Yes; whereas C.B.C. I think pleases some of the people some of the time. The hockey game Saturday night, it gets around to everyone, you cannot please them all the time, the private stations are playing to one group practically all the time I would say.

MR. COYNE: You say the function of the national network is not to please everybody all the time but to please most of the people some of the time?

MR. TAGGART: I think the minority should be considered, yes.

MR. COYNE: Why do you say in No. 2 that broadcasting fulfils a function of public service? What I have in mind is this: would you make the same statement with regard to, say, the daily press, the magazine industry, the motion pictures, other media of communication?

MR. TAGGART: To a certain extent, especially the daily press, yes, I wish it to perform more of a public service.

MR. COYNE: When you say:

"Because broadcasting fulfils the function

"of a public service, there must be public
"control of radio and T.V."

Why do you raise a distinction between radio and television on one hand, where you say there must be public control, and the press and the moving pictures where there is no public control?

MR. TAGGART: Well, possibly I would say there should be more control, but, in any case, there is more choice in the press and the moving pictures; you can accept or reject more readily. You can get your paper from New York or London if you want, but in radio unless you have a very powerful set you are pretty well confined to the Vancouver area or wherever you happen to be. You mentioned what did I mean by public service, and possibly one of the points in the brief I should read, in connection with that; it is point No. 7:

"Public service broadcasting should
"form an appreciable amount of the
"broadcasting day. Because those pro-
"grammes have limited and specialized
"appeal, it is difficult to find sponsors
"for them. Also, they are often ex-
"pensive and difficult to produce, in-
"volving much field work. Farm forums,
"education hours, detailed weather broad-
"casts, fishing and forestry reports
"come in this bracket. Moreover, the
"relatively high cost of such programmes
"is justified by their usefulness to

"large sections of our working community,
"many of whom have come to depend on them
"as an aid to earning their livelihood."

MR. COYNE: You are referring to certain types of programmes as being public service programmes?

MR. TAGGART: Yes, I am being more specific there, but I still say in general broadcasting should be a public service even when it entertains, or whatever you want to say it does.

MR. COYNE: Turning to the last sentence on page 1, it is in point 2, you say:

"Also, because the C.B.C. is a public
"service, its operating costs should be
"paid for from Consolidated Revenue."

I take it that your group would not feel that a license fee was a proper way in which to finance the C.B.C.?

MR. TAGGART; Well, I think it is more haphazard with the license when it was tried before with radio, the cost of collecting for it and enforcing it seemed to be very expensive, and if the C.B.C. had to depend on what they would get from licenses I think it is too insecure for such an important thing in our life. It should, within reason, receive what it needs.

MR. COYNE: You are suggesting here it should be received from general tax revenues?

MR. TAGGART: Yes, that is right.

MR. COYNE: On point No. 3 you speak of limited advertising as at present; you say the ultimate

aim should be to have no sponsors or commercials on C.B.C. networks. Why do you feel that should be the ultimate aim?

MR. TAGGART: Well, I do not think we have time for them, I think as the growth of the country increases with millions of people listening to something, I think it is a waste of their time; they may not be interested in a product at that moment. I think the country will be able to afford it as we grow. I think it is a thing we will have to put up with. At the present time on the C.B.C. the advertisements are usually in good taste, but I do not see why we should have to depend on advertising for our programmes. It should be the right of everyone to receive certain services. I think it is a practical aim, but as I said before, we simply have not the time for it. You get a catalogue if you want to buy something -- we are not hammering on that too hard.

MR. COYNE: On page 3 you refer to the programmes and you say:

> "It would seem that the C.B.C. is trying
> "much harder to bring programmes with
> "local, prpvincial and national Canadian
> "flavour and appeal to its hearers."

Now, some of the representations that we have received have indicated that the C.B.C. is able to deal with national matters but, because of its national commitment, is precluded in a large measure from serving the local interests of the various communities. Do you feel that the private stations have a place

in that sphere?

MR. TAGGART: Yes, I think they have done better work there and they have a better place there.

MR. COYNE: So, therefore, your position really is summed up in your final paragraph when you say that the present system of co-existence of public and private service has worked very well in radio, and I take it you are suggesting that a similar type of system should be developed in television?

MR. TAGGART: Yes, I would say the C.B.C. has in radio and television guaranteed and given as much as the facilities allow.

MR. COYNE: Just one other question, Mr. Taggart. On page 5 under your point 11 you say:

"By its nature, broadcasting is a public
"service and must be directly controlled
"through the elected representatives of
"all the people."

I would like to ask you, bearing in mind the system operated in the United States, why do you say broadcasting by its nature is a public service and must be controlled?

MR. TAGGART: I think by the tremendous influence it has; first of all, the lack of choice that people have in what they can listen to and, secondly, once they are listening to it, the tremendous influence it has on them, especially children. I might mention through a recent case which turned up in the United States where a number of civic-minded groups criticized the horror and sadism which

are on so many of the programmes for children, they seem to see a connection between that and the juvenile delinquency and they are helpless. In Canada we have, through Parliament, we have control over the C.B.C. I do not think I would have a voice there as I have here.

MR. COYNE: You feel that you are better able to have your views considered through a public agency such as the C.B.C. than through a private commercial system?

MR. TAGGART: Absolutely, yes, I think the term "monopoly" is simply a smear word, it is used to describe the C.B.C. and has no meaning at all. It is controlled by the people; at any time we can vote on this or that and change it.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Mr. Taggart, page 2 of your brief, point 5, you say:

"National networks in French and English
"also help to unite a bi-cultural, widely
"scattered population."

The word "national" strikes me, by national, of course you mean coast-to-coast or as nearly coast-to-coast as possible; that is what you imply by "national", is it?

MR. TAGGART: Well, not necessarily, maybe eventually as the needs of the population or the growth of population in certain areas grows, I don't know that a French network to Vancouver would be called for. Ideally, I suppose it would be nice as far as Edmonton.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Well, it does exist as far as Edmonton now through the use of private facilities both in Alberta and Saskatchewan, and while the Commission was in Winnipeg and Regina we heard some of the cultural associations of Canadians of French speech there and the suggestion was made that as soon as possible the network which now reaches Edmonton could be extended to the Pacific Coast. I understand that there are about 45,000 French-speaking people in this area, and I was wondering if it would be possible, I do not mean financially, but I mean psychologically to do it? There are no stations here in French, there is only the C.B.C. and it means that some hours would be devoted to French, the English listeners would be deprived of that time. Do you think it would be psychologically possible to do that at the present time to a certain extent?

MR. TAGGART: I think so, apart altogether from the French-speaking people, I think it would be a good thing for the English people to have French-speaking programmes too.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: You would agree with Prof. Reid who appeared before us in Winnipeg? He suggested something else which was a novel idea, since we have two large networks that none of them be in entirely French or English; one would be predominantly English and the other predominantly French, but there could be an interchange to cover the whole country and get both groups -- from the Atlantic to the Pacific people could know what the

others are doing and thinking, a sort of cultural interchange from the predominating elements of both Montreal and Toronto, which are the two great originating points. Would you have any ideas on that?

MR. TAGGART: Yes, I would agree with that personally, but I am not sure it would work from the point of view of the extremists in both languages. I think they did try that at the start with the C.B.C., I think they gave the signals in both, and perhaps some news reports. I know the signal was in both languages in the first days. I would like to see that come back but, as I say, ---

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: You think there was some advantage in that, a few hours a week or a certain number of hours a week which would enable the people of this area to know what is doing in, say, the Montreal area?

MR. TAGGART: Yes, I think it would help.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Would it be acceptable, do you think?

MR. TAGGART: All I can say is, it would be acceptable to me, but I admit there is -- I think it should be tried on the basis of a small portion per week.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Thank you.

MR. TAGGART: The translation problem would be difficult. Certainly musical programmes and operas and ballets should go over very well.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: It is not being done at present on T.V., a ballet or, say, a musical

show where most of it is singing or music with just a few introductions, it may be a way to get the best that is produced in the French-language and yet visually acceptable.

MR. TAGGART: You say it is being done now?

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: No, but there are such programmes being produced in the East that could possibly be acceptable here because the language problem would not be too acute.

MR. TAGGART: Well, if they started an interchange between Toronto and Montreal, that would seem a good testing point.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: That I do not know.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have not been there yet. I have just one question arising from an interjection in your brief. You did point out at one stage that there was a right of appeal to the Exchequer Court?

MR. TAGGART; Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: So that we are all clear about it, that is only a very limited right of appeal, it only arises, I think your point was if you wanted, Section 21, particularly sub-section 1 of the Radio Act of 1936, the Broadcasting Act of 1936 be continued mainly to allow the Corporation to make regulations for the development of a national system; and you went on to point out that in such matters there was a right of appeal to the Exchequer Court?

MR. TAGGART: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: You made it sound as if that was a fairly wide right of appeal. I point out to

you it is only where there has been a violation or non-observance by a private station of the regulations and a finding for the suspension of the license of the private station that there is a right of appeal to the Excheque Court, and then only on questions of law arising out of the making of such order.

MR. TAGGART: I see.

THE CHAIRMAN: At the same time, may I point out that I cannot recall a case when the C.B.C. has enforced its regulatory rights. Of course, that does not alter the fact that it has them, but no one can say it is being dictatorial or anything like that. I was only trying to raise an issue to point out to you that it was not as broad as perhaps you made it seem, this right of appeal.

Mr. Taggart, I want to thank you for your brief; it is important to us to have the views of private individuals and groups such as yours, and I appreciate also the fact that you came over from Nanaimo especially for this, and we thank you for taking the trouble.

MR. TAGGART: Thank you for hearing me.

SUBMISSION OF THE BRITISH COLUMBIA ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS

APPEARANCES:

Mr. Maurice Finnerty

Mr. C.J. Rudd

Mr. F.H. Elphicke

Mr. A.G. Seabrook

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief we have is from the British Columbia Association of Broadcasters, Mr. Finnerty, I think, is here, and if you have any associates with you I want you to bring them along to the table.

We will begin by marking your brief as Exhibit No. 76.

EXHIBIT NO. 76: Brief of The British Columbia Association of Broadcasters.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you go on and present your brief, please?

MR. FINNERTY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to depart a little bit from what seems to be the established procedure by most people presenting briefs. I would like to do this because yesterday there were several references to proprietors of private stations that I do not think were intended in the way that they may have been interpreted, but I felt that the press or someone might have got the impression that we merely enjoy licenses and punch cash registers and were motivated by monetary desires alone; so I think I will give you a little

of the background of our Association, those of us who are representing the private broadcasters.

I am the President of the British Columbia Association of Broadcasters. I am also a Director of the Canadian Association of Broadcasters and a Director of the Western Association of Broadcasters; I am a former Member of the Legislative Assembly of British Columbia for the Constituency which my radio station serves. I am a Past-President of the Penticton group of the Canadian Legion, I am a member of the Penticton Board of Trade; I am President of the Penticton Peach Festival Association, and a member of the Penticton Rotary Club.

I have with me my Vice-President, Mr. C.J. Rudd who has 15 years in broadcasting and who operates radio station CHUB in Nanaimo; he is Vice-President of our Association, he is also Director of the Canadian Association and a Director of the Western Association of Broadcasters; he is a member and Past-Director of the Nanaimo Rotary Club and he is a member of the Nanaimo Chamber of Commerce.

I also have with me the Past-President of the British Columbia Broadcasters, Mr. F.H. Elphicke, whom you know; he has 26 years in broadcasting, is Past- President of the Association, Past-President of the Western Association, also Past-President of the Canadian Association of Broadcasters; he is a Past-President of the Vancouver Rotary Club, the Past-Chairman of the Community Chest Campaign Committee of Vancouver and Past-Chairman of the Ad and Sales

Bureau; a member of the Vancouver Board of Trade and a past-member of the Council; a Director of our Exhibition.

I also have with me one of our Directors, Mr. A.G. Seabrook of Vernon, British Columbia, who operates radio station CJIB; he has 25 years in the broadcasting business, he is a Director of the Vernon Rotary Club; a Past-President of the Rotary Club; a Past-Director of the Board of Trade; a Director of the Community Concert Association of Vernon, and is a Director of the Vernon Canadian Hockey Association whose team are the present holders of the Allan Cup.

Unfortunately we do not have with us Mr. Jack Pilling, another of our Directors who is in the East, but he has had 29 years in radio, has a record of public service in his community comparable to the others I have given you, and he is the operator of radio station CHWK in Chilliwack.

(Page

I don't give you this information in any sense that we as individuals or collectively are trying to create any other impression than that we are a section of the community, and as individuals that we have made individual contributions, to a lot of other community efforts apart from broadcasting.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Finnerty, your station is CKOK?

MR. FINNERTY: Yes, in Penticton. Once again I propose to vary a little bit from the procedure followed so far, with your permission. In doing so it is with this intention: I have followed your deliberations yesterday and today, and I believe that I now have a better idea of how we can better assist you, because that is what we are here for, and so I propose to deal a little more fully with the problems that I think appear to me that you are more concerned with.

THE CHAIRMAN: That will be helpful.

MR. FINNERTY: The first part of the brief I will read, and then go back to what I think are the important things.

"The British Columbia Association of Broadcasters and its individual members are happy to have this opportunity to bring to your attention our thinking on some of the subjects contained in the Terms of Reference of this Commission on Broadcasting.

"The British Columbia Association of

> Broadcasters is a non-profit and completely voluntary association of privately owned broadcasting stations in British Columbia, which happily enjoys 100 per cent membership. The object of the organization is '. . .to support every movement to advance the radio art and to encourage and aid, with especial reference to radio broadcasting, in the development of musical and literary genius; to promote a closer cooperation between its members and the owners of receiver sets, the radio public and all others affected; to assist in the development of Canada by means of radio . . .'."

I might add that our Association was formed ten years ago for this purpose.

> "We respectfully bring to your attention, gentlemen, that each of these eighteen privately owned and operated radio stations in British Columbia has a record of outstanding service in its own community. Many of these stations will undoubtedly take the opportunity to bring before this Commission a report of its community service activities. We would like at this time to observe in passing that free enterprise radio stations in British Columbia were established in such remote and relatively small communities as Dawson Creek and Prince George, to serve communities that were not being served by radio."

By "serve communities" I mean the larger area rather than the smaller area that sometimes is and has been

served by a repeater.

"All the way from these northern centres, through the agricultural valleys of the interior, the industrial centres of the southeast corner of the province, into the metropolitan markets of Vancouver and Victoria, and to the Island coastal centres of Port Alberni and Nanaimo, each of these free enterprise stations has met the test of its right to its licence through its devotion to the service of its community, in every possible way, from the locating of lost pets to the saving of lives in time of flood and disaster.

"The British Columbia Association of Broadcasters as it appears today before this Royal Commission is both proud and humble -- proud of the opportunity given to its members to serve their community in such a vital and rewarding way, and humble in acknowledging the wonderful manner in which the people of our communities have expressed their confidence in our stewardship of the wave lengths assigned to us, by their substantial use of the service we offer, as shown in the surveys of Elliott-Haynes, International Surveys, and the Bureau of Broadcast Measurement."

If I may go back, sir, to show you the diversified centres in which our members are located: stations in Chilliwack, Dawson Creek, Kamloops, Kelowna, Nanaimo, Nelson, New Westminster, North

Vancouver, Penticton, Prince George, Port Alberni, Trail, three in Vancouver, Vernon and two in Victoria.

"All of the British Columbia Association of Broadcasters are members of the Canadian Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters. This Association goes on record as endorsing the recommendations of the Canadian Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters. We should also like to go on record as approving and endorsing the resolution passed recently at the meeting of the B. C. Liberal Association, which reads as follows:

"'WHEREAS this Convention recognizes the magnificent contribution made by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to Radio in Canada and the unity of the country;

"'BUT WHEREAS the present system of regulation of commercial radio and televison by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, a Government owned Corporation, which is itself in the business of Radio-Television operation, places the private operator under the control of his own competition and so directly deviates from the liberal principle of impartiality and freedom to compete, and tends to result in a situation not in the best interest of the Canadian people;

"'THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that regulation of commercial radio and television be transferred from the Canadian

Broadcasting Corporation to a separate Board responsible to an appropriate Minister for the supervision of both private and State owned radio and television.'

"To summarize briefly, this brief recommends:

"(a) That free enterprise radio and television broadcasting stations and CBC radio and television broadcasting stations alike, be subject to such direction and regulations as may be essential to the best interest of all listeners, administered by an Independent Regulatory Body.

"(b) The immediate licensing of a competitive basis of all available TV channels in Canada as applied for.

"(c) That the free enterprise radio stations and the free enterprise TV stations of Canada be given the right to better serve nationally, by forming as desired their own regional and national networks."

Here, Mr. Chairman, I would like to leave the rest of the brief with you and deal specifically with these three points, one in particular, and I wish to do this because, as I say, as a result of listening to your deliberations I feel that I can be of more assistance.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. There may be some questions on your written brief which we will want to ask you later, but this is a perfectly satisfactory way to proceed.

MR. FINNERTY: Sir, may I first deal with the

question of the independent regulatory board. This is a most difficult question, and it is a difficult question to explain because there are so many things involved in it that cannot explained merely by, "What do you hope to get from an independent regulatory board that you don't now get from the regulations as they are now administered?"

I would like to give you a few of my views and some of them, because of my own experience, may be personal.

I am relatively new in the broadcasting business; just under six years. I got into the broadcasting business in what is known as probably the hard way in that I got in as an investor and I bought a station, myself and associates, and I am the biggest holder of stock in the group; bought a station that was, in effect, bankrupt, operating at an average loss of $1,000 a month, that was under-powered and required a substantial capital investment. We did so because we felt it was an investment that could be, with proper management, both a good investment, and I did so because I felt it was the type of business that had particular appeal to certain things that I like to do, a business that appealed to me in the fact of service alone within the community. I don't want to go into any details as to that, but I want to say the necessary investment was made, the station was expanded, and the station is now, and has been for some years, a very successful operation.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are not dissimilar from the motives that actuate most business men; they think it is a good investment, and it is doing something they want to do.

MR. FINNERTY: As a result of it I think in some ways I have an advantage because of not having too much experience in broadcasting and I probably do not inherit the past history that may embitter me or change my point of view.

During the years I have been in broadcasting I have been honoured by my fellow broadcasters, and I believe my operation has been recognized in that they have chosen me to represent them in various ways, and through those years I have acquired, I think, a pretty fair knowledge of the industry as an industry, and certainly of my own business as an individual operation.

One of the things that alarms me, and I believe indirectly and in a difficult way to explain that this stems into this question of regulation, my experience prior to broadcasting was in a business which is regulated -- the insurance business. I may say that I operated in the insurance business very successfully. I had contacts with many insurance people and I was active in trade associations in the insurance business. Never in my experience did I ever find a climate of misunderstanding -- and I am quite sure a lot of it is misunderstanding -- existing between the regulatory body in the insurance business, such as I

have found existing between the regulatory power and the operators in the broadcasting business. I believe that this -- and I can only describe it with one word -- almost "fear" that exists on the part of the private broadcasters is something that is detrimental to the national interest and is something that is harmful, I believe, both to the operation of the CBC and to private broadcasters.

This is the situation as I see it from my viewpoint.

I could quote at length to you a lot of little things which have happened in regard to the interpretation of regulation that have caused misunderstandings and recriminations. I don't want to get into that. You have already on file two pages of instances of things of that nature that were filed with you in Ottawa. However, I do want to point out one or two things. For example, in Kelowna they used to carry the Metropolitan Opera broadcast. This broadcast was fed to them in the morning because of the time differential. This was not a satisfactory arrangement to the station for two main reasons; one, being on the air in the morning it deprived a lot of people who worked Saturday morning of an opportunity of hearing the programme, and since it was the interesting type of programme they felt it should be played when that minority, at least, would have an opportunity of hearing it. Secondly, from a financial point of view Saturday morning is a valuable local time commercially to the station,

whereas Saturday afternoon is generally open, and a programme in there of the length of the Metropolitan Opera would not disturb the actual financial operation. They applied for permission to delay the programme from morning to afternoon and replay it in the afternoon, and were refused. This, in itself, does not seem like a great problem, but right at almost the same time, 181 miles south of Kelowna, on the American side of the line, in a city called Wenatchee, Washington, Radio Station KPQ, operated by a man named Jim Walling, also had exactly the same problem; I may say, a little worse problem. They had to make a choice between carrying the Metropolitan Opera on Saturday morning, which was originated on the ABC network and which they were affiliated with, and accepting a broadcast of the game of the week, probably Notre Dame against somebody or other -- the football game of the week. So, they had the problem in the community of either satisfying the people who wanted to hear the opera or the people who wanted to hear the football game when both were on at the same time. They applied to the originating network, ABC, and got permission to delay the programme and carried the opera in the afternoon. Whereas the Kelowna station was unable to get that same privilege. This is one thing, and I just quote this one example as a minor thing. There are other things, and you have heard some discussion on the frequencies.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, if this is a convenient time to ask you, was any reason given for the refusal

to allow the delay?

MR. FINNERTY: The reason, I understand, was that permission could not be had from the originating network, which was the ABC network. I discussed this with the assistant station manager and the manager of a Toronto station -- actually the assistant manager of the Toronto station is here -- and, as I understand it, they applied for permission and were told it was not possible for the CBC to get this permission for them. The unfortunate part of it all was that since at that time this was a sponsored commercial programme, the programme was dropped on the station.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't want to interrupt you, but have you any reason to doubt the truth of the statement that they had not been able to get the ABC approval?

MR. FINNERTY: No, sir, I am not trying to intimate that they were not telling the facts in regard to it, but the point I am trying to make is that the American station dealing with the same network directly, as a member of the network, were able to get permission.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, there may be any number of explanations for that, but how would a separate regulatory board make any difference to this instance you have given?

MR. FINNERTY: Well, sir, I don't believe I can make my main point until I finish.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I am sorry to interrupt, but I am anxious to follow you, and you started on

the separate regulatory board and started to quote some instances, which I thought applied to the separate regulatory board, and I am not following you here as to what this has to do with the separate regulatory board; I don't see it at the moment.

MR. FINNERTY: I started on the separate regulatory board and then in attempting to show what I think is a situation that exists, because broadcasters rightly or wrongly blame this on the CBC in its function as an operator as well as the regulating board -- and this is one of the things that I hope to show you is part of the background of a situation which I think is harmful to both the CBC and the private stations.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I apologize for interrupting your train of thought.

MR. FINNERTY: I have two instances: one is the taking of the actual frequency of CFCM, Calgary, and the other is the frequency of CFRB, Toronto, after both stations had been on these frequencies for over fifteen years. In both instances I assume that the CBC considered this and that they decided it was in the national interest that they have these frequencies. However, I believe that the mere fact that the decision was made by the CBC, with their dual capacity of operator and regulator went to build up a lack of co-operation and a lack of understanding between private broadcasters and the CBC.

I wish to deal briefly in connection with

the same thing with the channel situation here in Vancouver and Victoria where originally channels 6, 8 and 10 ---

COMMISSIONER STEWART: You are now on television?

MR. FINNERTY: Television, yes. Channels 6, 8 and 10 were originally allocated to Vancouver, and Channel 2 to Victoria. Later on the allocation was changed and 2 was placed in Vancouver and 6 in Victoria. Now, there has been a licence granted in Victoria on Channel 6, and we are advised that because of side channel interference this will, in effect, cause a situation in Victoria where viewers in Victoria will have difficulty getting Channel 5 from Seattle, and we feel if the Victoria private station operates Channel 6 in Victoria they will create animosity towards themselves, because by their allocation and operation they will be blamed by the Victoria viewers for interfering with another alternative signal.

I don't want to belabour these things, and I point them out because I want to come to my point in regard to this question of regulation. In so far as private broadcasters are concerned -- and now I am dealing with it as I see it from the point of view of coming into the broadcasting business less than six years ago -- I regret, and I think it is regrettable for the country, that there has not been a climate established between the CBC and private broadcasters, who in a lot of instances are joined

together for network purposes, in the interests of national unity and national programming, and I feel that this in some way decreases certainly the ability and efficiency of the CBC in performing their objectives. I think, Mr. Chairman, that there is a defect and it may be an unwarranted feeling on the part of broadcasters that the mere holding of regulatory powers by the CBC, who compete with us and with whom we are connected as network affiliates, a lot of us, that this in itself reduces the overall efficiency of broadcasting in Canada, and I believe that if this climate was improved, and that if arrangements between affiliates and networks were on a voluntary basis, and if they were negotiated in a manner -- or, negotiated without the knowledge that there was regulation in the same hand that they were negotiating with, it would improve that climate and would lead to a better co-operation between the two, and, consequently, better use of the medium.

The second point is the immediate licensing on a competitive basis of the available TV channels. In the day and a half that I have been here, sir, this point has been discussed from all points of view. A lot of opinions have been given, and I am quite prepared to answer any questions you have on it, and I am quite sure other members of our group are prepared to answer any questions which you have on it, to the best of our ability.

The network situation has been discussed. The views that have been put forth are largely the

views that we subscribe to. We see advantages in our ability to give better service by regional networks. On a very long term basis -- we think on a long term basis that a start on regional networks could and would grow into a second national system that would give a second service to the people of Canada, and it could be done through the advertising revenue alone.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you talking of radio or TV, or both?

MR. FINNERTY: I am talking of radio right now, sir.

These are the remarks that I have given in regard to this, and I would be very pleased to follow this up with any additional information we can give you as a result of our remarks.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for an interesting exposition of your submission. If it is convenient to you, I think we will not start the questioning now, as we would not finish it before lunch time.

---The hearing adjourned at 12.20 p.m. until 2.50 p.m.

- - - - - -

---On resuming at 2:50 p.m.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Finnerty, just referring to your remarks this morning and to the instance that you gave respecting relations with the C.B.C., if you like, in the case of the Kelowna station and their inability to secure the right to delay the programme, did you say whether you knew what the reason had been for the refusal of that delay, that right of delay?

MR. FINNERTY: The reason, I understand, was that the C.B.C. was unable to get the permission from the Union for this sort of thing.

MR. COYNE: In other words, it was not their -- they must have tried to get the permission and were unable to do so, is that right?

MR. FINNERTY: I assume that would be right.

THE CHAIRMAN: There would be no C.B.C. purpose in not agreeing?

MR. FINNERTY: No, I merely mentioned it as an instance, probably not important in itself but because of the similar handling of the thing in an adjacent area that caused some misunderstanding.

THE CHAIRMAN: But not misunderstanding with the C.B.C.?

MR. FINNERTY: I think some misunderstanding between the operator and the C.B.C.

MR. COYNE: But surely it would have made

no difference if some other body other than the C.B.C. had been in a regulatory position?

MR. FINNERTY: Quite right; but in connection with this, the point I am trying to establish is, that a lot of misunderstandings come about through operating difficulties or through operating policies sometimes help create this fear and this misunderstanding of the regulating powers as well, and my point is that I believe if there was a separation that this in itself would create an atmosphere where there could be closer co-operation and less misunderstanding.

MR. COYNE: Well, really, you can correct me if I am wrong, but are you saying in effect that there is a sort of psychosis of fear, if you like, in the private broadcasters vis-a-vis the C.B.C. which would disappear if there was some other body doing what the C.B.C. is doing?

MR. FINNERTY: I believe there is. I stated before that I have worked in another industry that is regulated and at no time did I ever feel that my colleagues and competitors in that industry -- that within that industry there was an atmosphere or a climate that involved a sense of fear. I feel that in the broadcasting business -- and a lot of it may be completely wrong, and the figment of the imagination of some of us -- that this does exist.

THE CHAIRMAN: But in the Kelowna incident, why would the reaction be fear where the story is, as you said, that they tried to get it, there

was no reason for not getting it. Now, I can see various reactions to that such as irritation or indignation or any one of a dozen reactions, but why fear?

MR. FINNERTY: I did not contribute especially this particular incident to the fact that I do think there is a fear among broadcasters to stand up for certain things; I merely quoted it as being probably one of the unrelated incidents which leads to a misunderstanding which I think had led to a climate in which there is an atmosphere that I do not think is good for broadcasting, and I mean both private and public broadcasts.

MR. COYNE: Would you be prepared to say that perhaps some of the feeling of fear has been self-induced?

MR. FINNERTY: I think that would be a fair statement, some of it has been self-induced, and what I think I would like to see would be conditions that might alleviate this sort of thing; and that is why I say that insofar as a separate regulatory board -- I do not think that in dealing with an individual in regard to regulations and in dealing with a separate individual in regard to operating that you can confuse the two, but when you deal as we do who have network affiliations with a person who is in charge of public relations between the network and the station and who is at the same time in charge of the regulations and seeing that they are fulfilled, then I believe that this is just one of those things that helps to set a climate that I do not think is

healthy.

MR. COYNE: Supposing as an administrative matter the two functions of station relations and broadcast regulations were divorced so that they were not in fact handled by the same person; station relations, I gather, is more of an operational question whereas broadcast relations is not primarily related to operations as such?

MR. FINNERTY: Yes, the regulations are the regulations governing the operating, I agree with that, but I think it was a mistake in the first place to lump the two of them together. My experience in public relations has been that the public relations group or the public relations staff of any corporation or organization are concerned with creating co-operation, and the other part of the function is the disciplinary function, and I agree that that -- I do not think that I, if I were heading an organization, would mix them, the disciplinary function with the public relations function.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Dunton did say that in his capacity -- he has told us in answer to some questioning that in his capacity as Director of the Broadcast Regulations or whatever it is, he did report direct to the Board of Governors and was under their jurisdiction, whereas with respect to station relations he works with the General Manager; but your point is, the same man should not be doing both jobs?

MR. FINNERTY: My point is, if I were

handling the operation I would consider it inadvisable in the interests of public relations and in the interests of enforcement of regulation to have the two. I do not wish to criticize the individual concerned; we have worked with him and we realize the difficulties that he has to work under.

THE CHAIRMAN: On this point of regulation, I am just trying to get the full facts here; are there different kinds of regulation in your view? You used a word, and you often lump everything in under the one word, is there a distinction between the regulations which are sort of the laws and basic regulations of observance of channel frequency, radio frequency or matters of observance of power? You could perhaps go on through some of those and other things which are really operational regulations, the two being quite separate. In other words, there are the sort of underlying laws governing this business which is one kind of regulation, and regulations relating to the day-to-day operations which has another meaning in the word regulation; do you draw any distinction/between those different functions at all?

MR. FINNERTY: I believe there are basic regulations that are important regulations and the enforcement of them is a matter of prime public interest. I believe there are also regulations that are operating regulations and that are very debatable in their importance, and I think it is in the confusion of these two things that a great area of misunderstanding arises. We are inclined, I believe,

to classify all regulations as regulations, to lump them ---

THE CHAIRMAN: That is my point in asking the question, the failure to differentiate between the two kinds of things lumped under this one word. Do I take it from that you feel there are certain kinds of regulations which could not be divorced from operation?

MR. FINNERTY: Quite right.

THE CHAIRMAN: In the same way with independent business, you have certain so-called regulations for opening and closing your office and for questions of leave and time off and so on for employees, and that kind of thing; you have operational regulations, in other words, in an ordinary business?

MR. FINNERTY: Yes, I believe that is quite right and this is where I think the separate regulatory body could be of a great deal of assistance in regard to the basic regulations. I would not concede that they would be -- that there would be any delegation of authority through a separate regulatory body, say to the C.B.C., in regard to the basic regulations; on the other hand, there would have to be a delegation of authority to have operating regulations if you were going to operate a network and under normal course of events I believe the station affiliates would negotiate with the C.B.C. as a network and would agree to certain conditions of operation, and naturally when a C.B.C./regulation operating of the network in the minds of the affiliate imposed

an unfair obligation on him he would appeal to the separate regulatory board, and then I believe the separate regulatory board would hear both sides of the picture and, as the judicial body in this case, would give a ruling; and I believe that if the ruling was made in that way and through that process, that then you would not have this situation that exists today when you have the confusion between the two regulations and you have the one body operating and regulating.

MR. COYNE: You say "give a ruling", Mr. Finnerty, what would their ruling be based on, public interest?

MR. FINNERTY: I think that primarily the separate regulatory board would be charged with looking after the public interest, and that the ruling would be a ruling after hearing the submissions of the two parties involved, and where public interest would be harmed if the ruling was made one way or the other, or whether the public interest would be protected.

MR. COYNE: But the basis would still be as it is today, with the C.B.C. -- what is the public interest?

MR. FINNERTY: You mean -- are you asking me what public interest is?

MR. COYNE: No, I am not asking you, I am saying any regulatory board which was required to adjudicate on an appeal in the circumstances that you mentioned where a private affiliate was disputing with the C.B.C. as to some network regu-

lation, they would have the say in effect or determine themselves what was or was not in the public interest.

MR. FINNERTY: Yes, sir; I do not think that there is any broadcaster that would put forward the argument that there is not a public interest in all matters of operation of business, whether by broadcasting, newspapers or any other thing, and in a lot of instances we have other laws that range from anti-trust laws on down to protect the public interest; and in a lot of instances we have a lot of court decisions that are, in effect, to look after the public interest, they have public interest in practically everything.

MR. COYNE: This would not be quite the same as what normally happens in a court of law where the court is required to interpret what the law is, a court is not normally concerned with what is or is not the public interest; they have to interpret the law?

MR. FINNERTY: Yes, but I am not a lawyer. But my understanding is that when a Legislature or a Parliament passes laws for the court to interpret that they are setting up the authority and have considered the matter and have established that the public interest shall be protected by these laws. I will go back to the statement that I believe there is a public interest in a democratic country in almost everything that is done in our country, and that there is an attempt through legislation, --

and often this is accomplished through voluntary associations concerned and quite often, as it was pointed out when someone referred to the medical profession and the legal profession, that the legislature in its wisdom will grant a charter to an association which is, in effect, for the purpose of policing the members of its association.

MR. COYNE: But you would agree, would you not, that the independent regulatory body which you suggest would base its decisions on its view of the public interest?

MR. FINNERTY: I agree.

MR. COYNE: In the same way that the Board of Governors of the C.B.C. today bases its decisions on what is or is not in the public interest. Now, they might reach different conclusion; I suppose if you had a dozen different bodies they would reach a dozen different conclusions as to what was public interest in the matter, but the considerations would be the same.

MR. FINNERTY: I believe so.

MR. COYNE: Now, going on to a slightly different aspect of the matter ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you leaving this?

MR. COYNE: Yes, I am, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: I wanted to ask one other question to see if Mr. Finnerty could give us some help on it. You see, one of the main problems in this whole inquiry is finance; we have heard some of this from some Members of Parliament

this week, a whole order-in-council is devoted to the problem of the heavy cost of broadcasting in Canada to the public purse. Now, the establishment of a regulatory board such as you suggest would necessarily involve extra expenditure of money, would it not?

MR. FINNERTY: Yes, I believe it would.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is hard to guess what it would be, but if you start a board with three or four or five members and pay their salaries, and the cost of the staff and offices and so on, it could come to thousands of dollars, could it not, for a year? You did say this morning, as I took it down, that there was a definite and it may be unwarranted feeling among broadcasters which would be removed if this separate regulatory body came about; do you think that this is the only way, if it is an unwarranted feeling, that the feeling could be eliminated? Must it be done at a substantial extra public expense?

MR. FINNERTY: This, sir, is the solution that we think will work. I do not think any of us in the broadcasting business came here with any idea of trying to impose expense on the Government or the taxpayers that is unnecessary, but this was pointed out yesterday that we have envisaged a board that would have other duties because there are other problems, and the appointment of this board and its expenditures would not necessarily be caused entirely by what we feel is the regulating problem in broadcasting. There may be another solution to it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am just asking for any suggestions you can give us. I am not trying to hold you to your words, but you used the phrase that it may be unwieldy but it is fair, you propose to eliminate this unwieldy or unwarranted thing by expenditure of a substantial amount of public money, and I am asking you if you could think of any other way it could be done without that spending?

MR. FINNERTY: I myself do not think that the cost of this board -- which we feel would have other functions which we feel are equally important -- would be excessive to accomplish what we hope it will accomplish, which is a better broadcasting climate, a better broadcasting service both private and public, for the country.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you agree with Mr. Elphicke with the idea that if you had this separate regulatory body you would have a better chance of getting networks, as he told us this morning?

MR. FINNERTY: I think that there cannot help but be, even though -- and I am sure it is not intentional a feeling or a pull towards the public end of broadcasting with which the regulatory board is now so closely associated -- it might well be that the new board or the new body might listen to the arguments of the C.B.C. and listen to our arguments and accept their arguments and we would have to accept their decision. Perhaps we are being eternally optimistic when we say we feel in a lot of instances that our arguments might prevail and

this is why we feel if we were arguing it in front of this type of board some of our ideas would be adopted and we know some would be rejected, but we feel that we would have had a better -- had more satisfaction, that we had a better opportunity to present our needs.

MR. COYNE: Do not you have to say in effect, Mr. Finnerty, when you make that statement that the Board of Governors of the C.B.C., because of the fact that they operate stations and a network, is not competent to determine what the public interest in radio and television broadcasting is?

MR. FINNERTY: No, I do not have to say that.

MR. COYNE: But do you not have to say that?

MR. FINNERTY: No.

MR. COYNE: Well, if they are competent to interpret the public interest, and if the separate regulatory board is to be charged with interpreting the public interest, would not the two bodies necessarily reach the same decision?

MR. FINNERTY: I do not think so, Mr. Coyne; I am quite certain that the Board of Governors as presently constitued are quite human, and I think it is a most difficult thing for them to spend Monday and Tuesday considering problems of the C.B.C. as an operating board and then on Wednesday considering in a completely separate function,with the experience of Monday and Tuesday having some indirect effect upon what happens on Wednesday. I do not

accuse the Board of acting in that way, but it is human nature and it will happen.

MR. COYNE: But should not what went on Monday and Tuesday have some effect if you have the separate regulatory board, if they are considering these matters surely they will have to consider in the same way that the Board of Governors considered in effect what went on Monday and Tuesday? In other words, the operation of the C.B.C. and the effect of any of their decisions upon that operation -- well, I would suggest to you, it would be as much in the minds or should be in the minds of the separate body as it would be in the minds of the Board of Governors.

MR. FINNERTY: I personally think it works exactly that way.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just one other thing: you quoted I think with approval the case of the professional societies, like the doctors and the lawyers societies, and so on.

MR. FINNERTY: Did you say I quoted with approval?

THE CHAIRMAN: I thought you did.

MR. FINNERTY: I said that legislators of provinces in their wisdom delegated, everyone does not approve of it, I think that by and large they do an excellent job, but I know of specific instances where some people do not agree but I think it meets with the majority of the people's approval and I think it serves quite well the public interest.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are they not, in those cases,

a body of lawyers who sit on a discipline committee or a body of doctors sitting on a committee, are they not regulating their competitors?

MR. FINNERTY: That is where I think most of the criticism of this method comes in.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Finnerty, one of the remarks that you made this morning which I took down was to the effect that arrangements between the C.B.C. and its network affiliates should be voluntary, is that correct? Did I take it down correctly?

MR. FINNERTY: Well, I think I said that and I would like to amplify it a bit. Conditions change in the broadcasting business and they change a lot, especially in the last three years I believe we went through a period where there was competition for network affiliations and I think that we are now in a period where there is little interest on behalf of the private stations in network affiliations. For instance, the network I am affiliated with has lost over three-quarters of its commercial revenue.

MR. COYNE: Is this the Dominion network?

MR. FINNERTY: This is the Dominion network, in the last three years -- and the original agreement was on the basis of, we agreed to carry 10 hours a week of sustaining programmes at no cost, to give the time, and we got whatever commercial was on; and at the time these arrangements were entered into it seemed, I believe, to most private operators, a pretty fair arrangement because among the sustaining programmes that we got were some

excellent programmes, and among the commercial programmes that we got were some great audience programmes, the Gillette fights and things like that. But I believe there is a feeling among a lot of affiliates that the balance has been greatly upset now. If the C.B.C. were going to, at this time, enter into new arrangements, I believe that the new arrangement would have to be modified. Now, I do not think that this is going to be a permanent thing because I have been watching the American networks and I am delighted to see the radio networks fighting back and creating such ideas as the weekend monitor show which is a new concept of radio; and I think the same thing will happen in Canadian network radio, and once again the networks will come back. So when I talk about "voluntary" they were negotiated on a voluntary basis but right now the basis would have to be changed because of the changed conditions.

MR. COYNE: But you do not really mean that the private radio stations should be able to refuse to accept C.B.C. services if they choose to do so?

MR. FINNERTY: No, the regulation that now exists, of course, is that if a station of the network cannot agree, the thing should be referred to the Minister and the Minister shall set the compensation, if any, that the C.B.C. shall pay for that station; but they have a perfect right to make that arrangement, and if they are charged with operating a national system and require outlets, I believe

that they have to have the right to acquire these outlets; in other words, to get their national programmes to the people.

THE CHAIRMAN: To acquire it outright as ownership for the purpose of being part of the national broadcast?

MR. FINNERTY: Through agreement, if possible, and if not possible through the provisions of the Act.

MR. COYNE: So you, for instance, are not suggesting that Section 20 of the Act, for instance, should be repealed?

MR. FINNERTY: No, I am not saying we should abandon -- what you are really asking me if that we should abandon the C.B.C.?

THE CHAIRMAN: It is not quite that; do we abandon the principle of public control over network privileged?

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Probably control not resting necessarily in the C.B.C. but this other regulatory body you are talking about?

MR. FINNERTY: I believe that they should have the authority to have controls to establish a public network in the interest of the people, but I do not restrict this to mean that there should not be another network and the Act as it reads is that they shall be charged with supplying a national system, but the national system.

MR. COYNE: But you are not suggesting that private stations or any station should be in a position to form any network they choose without having

to establish any case before some body, are you?

MR. FINNERTY: Well, I think that the -- I will have to go back a little further; I think if the policy is that networks are permissible, that then the regulatory board would probably be naturally interested in a network if the network was going to injure the public interest; that might be interpreted as affecting the C.B.C. network in certain instances.

(Page 1822 follows)

MR. COYNE: You are really saying, in effect, that Section 20 should be eliminated, are you not?

MR. FINNERTY: No.

MR. COYNE: It says that no private station shall operate in Canada as part of a network except with the permission of and in accordance with the regulations made by the Corporation. I interpret your submission with regard to the independent regulatory board that at the very least there should be substituted the words "the board" for the present words "the Corporation"; but do you think there should be any further modification in that very restricted provision?

MR. FINNERTY: This to me seems to be more a matter of policy than a matter of legislation. I don't think the Act forbids the present Corporation from granting network privileges.

MR. COYNE: Oh, no.

MR. FINNERTY: It is a question, I believe, of policy.

MR. COYNE: But should it remain a question of policy?

MR. FINNERTY: I think the policy should be changed and that the policy should be to grant private networks, and that under that very section of the Act.

MR. COYNE: The legislation should not be changed, but you feel that the board who administers the legislation should adopt a different policy

from that now followed by the C.B.C.?

MR. FINNERTY: That is right.

MR. COYNE: Although you admit that any such board will be charged with administering these powers in the public interest?

MR. FINNERTY: That is right.

MR. COYNE: In other words, you would have to persuade that board that it was in the public interest for a certain group of stations to establish a network?

MR. FINNERTY: Yes, that is exactly it.

MR. COYNE: You are not suggesting there should be no control by the board?

MR. FINNERTY: I am saying this, that the measure of control by the board should be at a minimum to accomplish what I think is the accepted concept of broadcasting in Canada, and the accepted concept, I think, is that if the Government of Canada decides that in the interest of the people there should be a national network for purposes of Canadian unity, then the board would administer regulations to ensure that, and I am not proposing that this be changed.

MR. COYNE: I take it from what you say that really you are not proposing any change in the legislation as it affects or as it deals with the question of network broadcasting?

MR. FINNERTY: As I visualize this, the present regulations would be probably turned over as they now exist to the new board.

THE CHAIRMAN: And the present legislation

with minor changes by putting in "the board" instead of "the Corporation"?

MR. FINNERTY: Yes, and that the matter of regulations that exist from then on will be a matter of regulations or removal of regulations requested either by the C.B.C. or by the private broadcasters and decided upon by the board in their wisdom.

THE CHAIRMAN: On the question of networks, again reverting to this effort we have to make on the subject of public expense and cost, in your brief you refer to the Dominion network: Is it the opinion of your organization or of you personally that the Dominion network should be eliminated?

MR. FINNERTY: Right now, sir, there is a sincere effort by the Dominion network itself -- by the employees and management of Dominion network itself to try and re-establish the Dominion network. They are considering, and have considered the actual new concepts that have come into the American broadcasting as the result of the situation that exists in the United States, and they have had a number of discussions with the affiliates of the Dominion network. My personal opinion would be that if the Dominion network is going to go on and programme for audience and come up with new concepts and new ideas, and is going to sell network time and sell it aggressively, that the network has a chance of surviving. If they are not going to do that, I believe it will fold and should fold.

THE CHAIRMAN: What I am trying to get at

is that this Dominion network costs the public some money: Should we keep it or should we not?

MR. FINNERTY: Here I think we are getting into this question of public interest.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is it in the public interest to keep the Dominion network, in your view, or isn't it?

MR. FINNERTY: I think it is in the public interest if aggressive means are adopted in order to provide more revenue for the network. For example, these Dominion network stations carry a number of hours per week of programmes that are sustaining and are aired as public interest and public service programmes which have national effect. If the Dominion network is abandoned, all the outlets on the network will be independent stations, and these programmes will be no longer heard. The yardstick is, I think, going to have to be, "How much, or what costs can we afford in order to retain these public service programmes that are carried?" The type of programmes ranges from B.B.C. Symphony, over an hour on Tuesday night, to Cross-Section, and a variety of programmes that certainly fall within the public interest or public type of sustaining programme.

THE CHAIRMAN: I really have two questions here, and one is to ask your advice as an experienced broadcaster, either individually or on behalf of your Association, whether you would advise in the public interest that we in the radio field confine ourselves to a single national service such as is

provided in the Trans-Canada network, or whether we should try to keep the Trans-Canada network and the Dominion?

MR. FINNERTY: I would like to speak for myself because I happen to be a Dominion network affiliate. From a purely personal and business point of view it would not make me unhappy as a businessman if the Dominion network broke up tomorrow. The average revenue to the station from network commercial programmes is around $100 a month. Three years ago it was averaging $500, $600, $700 or $800 depending -- in a market of my size -- depending on how many commercial programmes you had. So, it is no longer a factor from the revenue point of view. It is a factor in that some of the commercial programmes have a big wide interest from an audience point of view, and I mention the Gillette Fights for one, and the one-hour Woolworth programme on Sunday afternoon which is American and an excellent programme. From my point of view, I am in what is called a single station market, and audience is not as compelling a factor to me as it is in a competitive audience market. From a personal point of view there is no loss to me from a straight business point of view in the network folding up.

THE CHAIRMAN: May I interrupt you there for a second? Would it be an advantage or worse for you if the Dominion network disappeared tomorrow, not in terms of the actual money you get for commercial programmes, but for the costs that there

would be to you to replace these programmes that you would no longer be getting; would that be a cost to you or not?

MR. FINNERTY: Yes, I think that would be a cost to me, and also I think to the C.B.C., because through the Dominion network affiliations they are getting aired in a lot of markets, where they have no Trans-Canada coverage or no Trans-Canada audience, their public service programmes, and if these programmes went off the air I think the C.B.C. would have to consider ways and means of making them available to the people of that area.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: In other words, you might find a competitor in a new station in Penticton?

MR. FINNERTY: Conceivably, but I don't think anyone is going to apply unless it would be the C.B.C.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Well, I was thinking of that in terms of the C.B.C. because of the responsibility they have of operating a national system.

MR. FINNERTY: The C.B.C. use boosters and there may be a request for more boosters all of which cost money to buy and install, and I think these are all factors that have to be considered.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't want to press you, but I want your recommendation, and a moment ago you said you would not be unhappy if the Dominion network disappeared tomorrow. Would you be happy?

MR. FINNERTY: No, I would be happy if

the Dominion network went out and re-established itself as an important network.

THE CHAIRMAN: So, on balance, your personal view would be in favour of retaining the Dominion network and making it more vigorous, more successful, rather than abandoning it and sticking to the one Tran-Canada network?

MR. FINNERTY: This is a personal view.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, I understand.

MR. COYNE: Just turning for a moment to your brief at page 6, near the bottom of the page, you are speaking of the submission that there should be additional T.V. channels in British Columbia and you say in the fifth last line:

"It is economically unsound for the C.B.C.
"to operate expensive broadcasting studios
"in the Province of British Columbia
"anywhere except in the City of Vancouver."

Surely it is economically unsound for the C.B.C. to operate broadcasting studios anywhere, isn't it?

MR. FINNERTY: Apparently it is.

MR. COYNE: Well, why do you make this statement that it is economically unsound for them to operate anywhere except in Vancouver?

MR. FINNERTY: This might clarify the situation for you: The population of British Columbia, while we are a very large province, I made the statement in Texas to a group of Texans one time that British Columbia was larger than the State of Texas but the fact of the matter is that 80% of our

population is concentrated in the lower mainland area and 20% of it is scattered over a tremendous area, and this sort of thing applies to a lot of things in British Columbia, and the economy of British Columbia is governed by this population situation. To a great extent this would apply to any business, and this is why you have the concentration of industry and distribution in finances down in the Vancouver area.

MR. COYNE: But then you go on:

"This can by no means be construed as "satisfactorily serving the widespread "and progressive province of British "Columbia."

You agree, do you not, that the C.B.C. national service is something that is of value to all British Columbians and should be available to them?

MR. FINNERITY: And must be supplemented by local stations in all these pockets all over British Columbia in radio and television.

MR. COYNE: Local stations carrying and distributing, if you like, the C.B.C. national service which would otherwise not be available in those areas?

MR. FINNERTY: I believe that is the concept we accept.

MR. COYNE: Turning to page 12, Mr. Finnerty, and I am reverting to this question of networks, you refer to the fact that the present radio broadcasting regulations in Canada make it impossible

for free enterprise radio or T.V. stations to form a network: is that literally true -- "impossible"?

MR. FINNERTY: It may not be literally true in law, but it appears to me to be literally true in fact so far as we are concerned. We out here have interpreted the actual policy as being that except for individual instances the network privileges would not be granted to private broadcasters, and we have interpreted it as meaning we would not be allowed to set up a permanent network opposition to the C.B.C. network.

MR. COYNE: When you speak of an independent network, where would your own station -- which is already an affiliate of a network -- fit into that picture? In other words, if you are an affiliate of the Dominion network do you think that in addition to that you should have the right to be affiliated with some other network?

MR. FINNERTY: Oh, yes.

MR. COYNE: Is that common practice in the United States?

MR. FINNERTY: It is done in a lot of places in the United States, and I know of stations who are basic network affiliates of one network and who accept and receive other network programmes as well, and in television it was common practice. It was necessitated because of the granting of television licenses. In Seattle which operated with one television station for a number of years, that television station carried all networks. I was in

Desmoines, Iowa, where the university operates a commercial station there to serve the State of Iowa, and they have the three networks and they choose what they think -- it is very commercial, even though operated by a university -- and they choose the programming from the three networks to give them what they think is the best programming and, I assume, the best financial arrangement.

MR. COYNE: To your knowledge has there ever been a proposal from any group of British Columbia stations to the C.B.C., a concrete proposal, directed towards the formation of a network amongst them?

MR. FINNERTY: Not to my knowledge. I think it has been generally accepted, and accepted by people with a lot more experience in the broadcasting industry than I, that this was the status quo and that in attempting to set up a competing network, which would compete for commercial business on the national level or on the regional network, was something that just would not be granted.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you never went down and said, "We want a network between 6.00 o'clock and 7.00 o'clock five nights a week and we are going to put this kind of programme on it and we are going to do this kind of operation and these are the stations tied-in" -- you never tried it out?

MR. FINNERTY: No.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: In reply to Mr. Coyne you talked about a permanent network, which I imagine that would be something that would be constant

the year round, that you could use: Have you ever made application for a temporary license, a temporary network for a period of a week or two weeks, or anything like that?

MR. FINNERTY: We have joined together some of the stations in the Okanagan Valley on occasions for specific sports events.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: And that has never been refused?

MR. FINNERTY: Never been refused, to my knowledge, no. In the case of the Allan Cup finals two years ago in Penticton, every station in British Columbia broadcasted it and it was not being broadcast on a network. It has always been our understanding, and I could be wrong, that this was the only type of temporary application that would be encountered.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: On these temporary applications, would you say the C.B.C. have been reasonable in their decisions?

MR. FINNERTY: Most reasonable.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Finnerty, you mentioned this situation in the United States where a single station may affiliate with two or three networks; is that the type of situation which you would envisage developing in Canada if there was a second independent network?

MR. FINNERTY: I think it would have to start on a small scale and start within regions, and then it would grow as it was proving economically sound and if there was the necessity for it.

MR. COYNE: I presume in the United States where this situation arises the station itself chooses which of the networks it is going to hook up to at any particular hour, does it?

MR. FINNERTY: There are firm agreements in regard to some of the network affiliations but these do not become a problem in the United States because of operating regulations of networks. I know an American station in the State of Washington who are an A.B.C. affiliate and who carry practically none of that network's output direct. They tape off the wire as it comes in, and then they re-programme their whole day so they can fit that in with local programmes and fit it in with, in some cases, network programmes off another network. They feel by doing it that way they can programme because of the time differential and because of the difference in habits between people with different backgrounds, especially occupational backgrounds. They are a fruit area as we are in the Okanagan, and they tape and delay, and sometimes delay more than overnight and re-programme, in effect, the network. They use their own programmes, they use A.B.C.'s programmes and, in some instances, they use programmes of the other networks, and because there is no restriction in their case on this question of taping and delaying, this is the solution to a lot of their problems and it allows them to mix different network originations.

MR. COYNE: Your Association maintains that they should have the right to form regional

and national networks: do you also claim that Canadian stations should have the right to affiliate with American networks?

MR. FINNERTY: No, we have not claimed that. As an Association we have not discussed it, so that I am not in a position to put forth an Association viewpoint on this. I have some personal views on it, but whether they would be of any importance to the Commission or not, I don't know.

MR. COYNE: In any event, your Association, and I understand the CARTB also, has not suggested it?

MR. FINNERTY: We have not suggested it nor did we discuss it at any time.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: I think you said the Dominion network has been gradually sinking in the red -- I suppose with the advent of television -- and that there is no room for two networks, and it has been losing money. On the other hand, you contemplate the building of another network in the future. May I draw the conclusion that the second network would offer a different kind of network programme and should be a money-maker, whereas the programme now supplied has no appeal -- either audience appeal or sponsor appeal?

MR. FINNERTY: I don't think a network as a network has any appeal. It is the sum total of the programmes that creates the appeal. When we say that we believe that in future a commercial network can be established, there are, I believe, a lot of factors in that. First and foremost we believe

that radio network is going to be revitalized and new ideas and concepts are going to be adopted, and it is going to adapt itself to the audience, and that the audience is going to come back to network radio for a lot of its entertainment, and this, consequently, is going to create an audience which is saleable from a commercial point of view. Secondly, we think that we are better equipped in the sound field. We have, I think, confidence in our ability as businessmen to operate, and as we do operate, small stations cannot provide the services even on a local basis that big stations do, but as they build their revenues they build their service to the community which comes out of the revenue, and this is the development that I think will take place on a national commercial network.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: But you would have to sell a different kind of programme from that being offered by Dominion?

MR. FINNERTY: I don't think that, sir. Right now Trans-Canada network has taken programmes off my station and put them on Trans-Canada network. I can give you a specific example, and I am not complaining. This is selling their network, which is part of their function. We carried for a number of years several quarter-hours a week in a 15-minute transcribed programmed sponsored by the Carnation Milk Company, and they bought two quarter-hours a week and paid for it on the station, and we carried this transcribed programme. About six months ago

the Trans-Canada network sold them my participation on the Trans-Canada network, so they must have persuaded them that network could do a better job than we could do. This was salesmanship and they took the business away from us. I think some of the business now going to television and some of the business waiting to get onto television could be sold by an aggressive radio network.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just following Mr. Turcotte's question, you have got the Trans-Canada radio network and I understood you to say a moment ago that you were rather inclined to favour the notion of building up the Dominion network into something worthwhile, better than it is today, and now you are saying you would also like to think it would eventually become a private network across Canada. Do you think the radio advertising business would support three such networks?

MR. FINNERTY: No, I don't think the radio advertising business would support three networks, and I equally I don't believe that the Dominion network will actually survive. I think when it stops operation that there is going to be then an opportunity and a need for certain regional network facilities, and I think it will be a number of factors, including the growth of the economy of the country and everything, which will allow them to go back up to a second system.

MR. COYNE: Would you regard that not as an immediate prospect, but as a relatively long-term prospect?

MR. FINNERTY: Long-term prospect, but I regard it as necessary that this question of networks by private stations be clarified in order that it has a chance to try to establish itself.

MR. COYNE: When you say "a private commercial network", the concentration is on the word "commercial", isn't it? In other words, the programme of any network is based upon the needs of that network to get commercial revenue and survive; isn't that true?

MR. FINNERTY: Yes, the revenue will be totally commercial.

MR. COYNE : So, in effect, it would not be the type of network which the C.B.C. operates through the advantage of having public funds available; it would be a network comparable, say, to one of the American networks which operates commercially?

MR. FINNERTY: It would have to be. It would be solely confined to the revenue from advertising, and that portion of the profit when you have got it to that point that could be devoted to prestige programmes, as they do on American networks, will have to be determined by the financial operation of the network.

MR. COYNE: But the commercial factor must have a very real effect upon the type of programmes which such a network can carry?

MR. FINNERTY: I believe it must.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Would you think the Dominion network even now might, if they could get

away from the hobbles put on them for national programmes, could go out and sell enough commercial time on the network to make it pay?

MR. FINNERTY: I don't say they could do it overnight.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: But as a long-term venture it could be done?

MR. FINNERTY: I believe it could be done.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: But again the C.B.C. would have to take cognizance of and allow them to put on programmes which would be saleable programmes or would be interesting to advertising sponsors?

MR. FINNERTY: Let me put it this way: there is lots of time available.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Yes. There is lots of time available; they are not selling it, and this is probably a very unfair question to ask you because it may put you in the position of being very critical, so if you don't want to answer it I will understand your reasons; but the point is, they have time available, but by reason of their obligations or the regulations, they have to put on certain programmes. Now, is it the question of those programmes that is stopping the sponsors from advertising, or is it inertia on the part of the C.B.C. in not going out and really selling the time? If that puts you in a bad spot, don't answer it.

MR. FINNERTY: I have no reason not to answer it, and I don't want anything that I say being taken as critical. I mean it to be helpful, if I

can. I don't think the programmes that we would call the public service programmes are stopping them from selling the commercial time that could be sold. I think the situation is that network radio right now is suffering from the effect of other competition and that it is more difficult to sell it and it requires a great deal of effort to sell it and it requires real salesmanship, and if I were charged with the responsibility of acquiring more revenue, the first thing I would look at would be my sales department. Usually when business goes down you increase your sales staff and create more business. It is the sales end of it that is the difficult thing.

(Page 1840 follows)

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you explain that one stage further; you are probably also recommending that in the present transitory phase radio is going through, it may be the product they are selling should be changing also.

MR. FINNERTY: They have that under consideration now. At the fall meetings that they have had they have taken a long look at some of these new developments on the American networks, and they have discussed with their affiliate stations a Canadian type of monitor programme across the board at night, and they are looking at the programme problem and I believe they will come up with some answers and we were told in July they would be prepared to put something comparable on.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have a couple of questions I would like to be clear on, Mr Finnerty, one on page 15 of your brief where you mention the Commission should do something and I am not clear what it is you are asking. You say:

> " -- the free enterprise stations come much closer to filling their overall responsibilities than do the CBC stations. No one to the best of our knowledge ever heard of CBU in Vancouver carrying announcements about lost budgies. Certainly no one every heard of a free enterprise B.C. station regularly broadcasting to a Canadian network a local news commentator. In our opinion this Commission must somehow correct these extremes."

What do you mean by that?

MR. FINNERTY: Well, under the present concept, as I understand it, the CBC has a national

role and the private stations have a local role. The comparison which was drawn was that we think we are very, very effectively handling our local role, we think as community stations that we are almost the pulse of the community, that we are part of the community, that we are a lot closer to the people.

THE CHAIRMAN: I got that point, I can see the distinction between the function of the local station and the function of the national network, but you say:

> "In our opinion this Commission must somehow correct these extremes."

What do you want us to correct?

MR. FINNERTY: What we are saying there is in effect we have done an excellent job in our role and the next sentence is:

> "But should the free enterprise stations be restricted to such local activities?"

This really is in connection with the argument for network facilities.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think I see what you mean, you do not want us to start looking for lost budgies. Well then, another thing, again wanting to get the fullest information we possibly can, on page 2 we had, I think, if not in this brief in the brief that Mr. Elphicke presented, quite an impressive statement of public service that the local stations perform. That was a useful thing to have, that public service statement. I see you quote on page 2:

> "The object of the organization is 'to support every movement to advance the radio art and to encourage and aid, with especial reference to radio broadcasting,

in the development of musical and literary genius;'"

That is one of your objects and it continues on, but have you any evidence of efforts made towards carrying out that objective of your organization, namely the development of musical and literary genius?

MR. FINNERTY: Mr. Chairman, I have here a statement which was made in 1949, which, at that time, gave what every station was doing in the community. This time, instead of making up a brief which went through the community activities of every station you have already received in Ottawa or will receive from almost all the private stations of British Columbia a collection of letters that they have received from the community organizations which they have assisted.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not want to interrupt you, but you are talking about something different, you are talking about community service and I am talking about one of the stated objects of your organization, which is the development of literary and musical genius, and I just wondered -- if you have not it now and want to send it in I would like to have any evidence of these things -- I am not doing this for criticism, I am doing it -- you know as well as I do that you are often criticized for not doing enough for music and art and so on -- this has been one of the criticisms, and I think, if you could, you ought to answer it.

MR. FINNERTY: We have information on this and we will secure it and send it to you.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have one other question that has arisen On page 4 you quote with approval the endorsation of a resolution which says:

"Therefore be it resolved that regulation of commercial radio

> and television be transferred from the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to a separate board responsible to an appropriate minister for the supervision of both private and state owned radio and television."

I am not talking about the question of a separate board as such but by your approval of the other part of that recommendation,"responsible to an appropriate minister". Now, we have had it put to us that there is a distinct advantage in having the present CBC being responsible to Parliament rather than being tied in to a government department through a minister; that is less apt to have direct governmental influence and is more responsible to the will of the elected representatives of the people. Have you thought of that phase of the recommendation?

MR. FINNERTY: Our submission we ourselves make is a separate regulatory board, this resolution was merely put in to show the Commission that there are other organizations who are thinking basically along the same principle.

THE CHAIRMAN: You do not say that, though; you say:

> "We should also like to go on record as approving and endorsing the resolution passed ---"

I just want to know if you will approve and endorse the motion of a separate regulatory board being responsible to an appropriate minister or as it is now being responsible to Parliament?

MR. FINNERTY: We would be very satisfied to have it responsible to Parliament.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am not talking about

whether you are satisfied or not, I am asking you which you think is better.

MR. FINNERTY: We get into the question of what is political interference and that is construed sometimes as being something that it is not. The Commission as we visualize it would be an independent regulatory board and we would be very concerned that it be just that, an independent regulatory board. We also think that in the matter of, for instance, finance, that it is sometimes called a political control but often it is not, it is an economic control, and this was put in with the feeling that responsibility to a minister but not with the idea that we were trying to change it

THE CHAIRMAN: You do not particularly make this suggestion that the notion that it would be better to have it that way than have it go to Parliament, that was not part of it?

MR. FINNERTY: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, Mr. Finnerty, I want to thank you and your associates for coming, and I think all the Commission have felt that in this debate and discussion which has been going on in this room, we have got the views of the private broadcasters as fully and as completely as we can. We are anxious to have it and we can get it only if you come forward as you have done.

MR. FINNERTY: We appreciate very much the understanding the Commission and its counsel have shown in the hearings, and we are glad to have been here.

MR. ELPHICKE: Mr. Chairman, may I make one suggestion on something that Mr. Stewart asked me yesterday. It is not in connection with the British Columbia Broadcasters, but we have been doing some

thinking; Mr. Stewart read from Dean Andrews' brief about the CBC staying away from the operation of the CBC and in practice becoming a regulatory board. I think my answer was something to the effect that I had not had time to consider it, but there is a side of that -- well, I have not as yet had full time to consider the matter, but it has been suggested to me, would there be any possibility of a good representation of private broadcasters on that board -- I merely report this now to show there is something going on; in other words, if there were eleven members of the board would it be possible to have five private broadcasters on it, a good representation?

COMMISSIONER STEWART: That is not for us to decide, but what would be your views if you were to have representation?

MR. ELPHICKE: I think we would still feel kindly but would prefer a separate regulatory body. I am pursuing what you said yesterday and I shall pursue it further.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will welcome any additional thoughts you have on it when you have time to work on it.

SUBMISSION OF B. C. FEDERATION OF LABOUR

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief is the British Columbia Federation of Labour. Mr. Home, we will mark your brief as Exhibit 77.

EXHIBIT NO. 77: Brief of British Columbia Federation of Labour.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have probably been sitting here for some time listening and know something of the procedure; will you go ahead and present

the brief as seems best to you?

MR. HOME: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and with your permission and that of the other Commissioners, I will read the brief through and elaborate on any points necessary.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you try to keep your voice up so that everyone in the room can hear you?

MR. HOME: This is a submission of the B. C. Federation of Labour (CCL) to the Royal Commission on Broadcasting. I have with me Mr. Smeal, who is the Executive Vice-President of our Association. To go back to the beginning of the brief, I think some slight explanation is necessary in regard to the B. C. Federation of Labour and the Congress of Labour. The Congress of Labour has now ceased to exist and we are now members of the Canadian Labour Congress, but the provincial bodies of the former Canadian Congress of Labour and the members of the Labour Congress will not officially be together until the fall, and, therefore, that is why we are still using the term Canadian Congress of Labour.

I understand a joint brief was presented to you as a brief from the Canadian Labour Congress and I think in fairness to some of the members who are present here today, and perhaps not familiar with the presentation of Labour, it would be well if I referred to that original submission which the Commissioners have received. The question has been raised by one of the other parties that quite often people making the presentation on behalf of our organizations are not reflecting the thoughts of the individuals within the organization.

In the last couple of years the CBC has been a subject matter at our conventions and it has come

in for very serious debate by the delegates attending these conventions who reported back to their local unions, and there has never been any objection taken to organized labour as to support of the CBC. In the brief submitted to your Commission on April 15, on page 2, of the Canadian Labour Congress, it refers to the Royal Commission on the National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, and says:

> "That the whole subject of television broadcasting in Canada be reconsidered by an independent investigating body not later than three years after the announcement of regular Canadian television broadcasting."

I assume that is what we are in the process of doing now.

Then, going on with that same report:

> "That the reconsideration of television broadcasting should be based upon the principles that the grant of the exclusive use of certain frequencies or channels for broadcasting shall continue to be under the control of the Parliament of Canada, and that the broadcasting and distribution of Canadian programmes by a public agency shall continue to be the central feature of Canadian broadcasting policy."

Also on page 3 the Congress referred to the Order in Council establishing this present Commission, Order in Council 1955-1796, and the Terms of Reference:

> "That the reconsideration of television broadcasting should be

based upon the principles that the grant of the exclusive use of certain frequencies or channels for broadcasting shall continue to be under the control of the Parliament of Canada, and that the broadcasting and distribution of Canadian programmes by a public agency shall continue to be the central feature of Canadian broadcasting policy."

That leaves very little doubt in Parliament's Terms of Reference that the question of maintenance of CBC is still paramount in the minds of the people delegated to govern in Canada. In case there is any doubt, the Congress makes its position clear, that they are not opposed to private stations only as an auxilliary to the CBC and believe that they perform a useful and necessary service.

They also draw to the attention of the Commission that there have been a number of Committees and Royal Commissions set up to examine this question of Canadian broadcasting policy, two previous Royal Commissions by the House of Commons itself, and on several occasions special committees on broadcasting, and they have maintained their position to maintain the CBC with public control of broadcasting.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not want to interrupt you, but we have the brief and we had nearly a half day of presentation of the brief of the Labour Congress in Ottawa, and if you are leading up to some point on it, this is quite a lengthy brief and I trust you are not going to summarize the whole brief again?

MR. HOME: Well, it was my intention, but we do not want to repeat, I think may be for the

benefit of people who may be listening to our submission, I think they will get the viewpoint. I will leave that now.

However, there is one viewpoint which I think has been raised and has not been drawn to the attention of the Commission, and I would like to submit it at this time. This has to do with the question of costs of television and the possible outcome of the terrific costs required for television broadcasting. Labour is rather concerned with the trend in the United States taking place at the present time, and this quotation is from the AFL-CIO News, International Publication, Washington, D.C., and the dateline is Saturday, May 5, 1956. I will be prepared to enter this as an exhibit if the Commission wishes me to.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is the name of the publication?

MR. HOME: AFL-CIO News, dateline of Saturday, May 5, 1956, and it reads as follows:

> "AFL-CIO Fights Paid TV Costing Viewers Millions.
>
> "The AFL-CIO told the Senate Commerce Committee that the best interest of the public lies in the continuance and improvement of the present system of free television rather than in the introduction of a system under which viewers would pay for their entertainment.
>
> "Testifying at hearings on the desirability of establishing a system of paid TV, Andrew J. Biemiller, AFL-CIO legislative representative, declared that 'this drastic proposal runs directly contrary to the basic

tenets of the American system of broadcasting. At no time has the American public, whose investment in television sets has reached $16 billion, been told it would have to pay for the privilege of watching television programs.'

Serious repercussions.

"Biemiller said that the introduction of this new concept would have 'serious repercussions' on the employment of workers throughout the entertainment industry by drastically changing the present system of competitive programs.

"Instead of having many programs to select from each night we would have only one or two at a time' he continued. 'The advent of this new form of television would also undoubtedly deal a further blow at the already hard-hit independent, community movie theatres throughout the country.'

"Biemiller questioned the main argument advanced by supporters of paid television that it would supply vastly improved programs. He pointed out that 'Shakespeare, ballet and serious music' already have become commercially acceptable TV fare and with the exception of a once-a-year heavyweight championship bout, virtually every major event in the world of sport is now telecast without charge over a coast-to-coast network.

Aid Few Promoters.

"What might happen under a paid television system is that certain types of

programs which are now offered free of charge would be transferred to the new system which would require payments from viewers,' he said. 'In effect, this would seem to be transferring the cost of the television programs from the commercial advertisers to the viewing public.'

"The thirty-five million set owners in America would not accept this shift without protest, he contended.

"'Paid television would require the viewer to contribute a specific sum for the privilege of enjoying certain television programs,' Biemiller said. 'Estimates of the cost of paid television to the viewer run from a minimum of $100 a year to over $1,100.'"

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't think we need mark it as an exhibit as since you read the major part of it, it will be in the transcript.

MR. HOME: This trend has developed in the United States where they have private broadcasting stations and because of the tremendous cost involved they are now turning to this new method of raising revenue, and I would suggest if Canadian television was given over to private TV, then we could look also for the advent of this new idea.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think there was an inquiry quite recently in Washington looking into the question of subscription television, but I don't know this is a recommendation. In fact, I understand the private broadcasters in the United States are very much split as to whether it is a good thing or not.

MR. HOME: That concludes our presentation, Mr. Chairman.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Mr. Home, I see that in your brief you consider that broadcasting is a national service and you approve of the policy which has been accepted up to now to consider it a public service. Then you go on at the top of page 2 to discuss the question of education and entertainment of the public, and I would like to know whether you make a distinction between the education aspect of broadcasting, whether in television or radio, and the entertainment aspect of broadcasting?

MR. HOME: Yes, there is, we consider, quite a distinction. Education programmes in our minds are the type of programmes that we may have on the question of citizens' forum, or a panel debate on a controversial issue called Pros and Cons, whereby there may be a certain amount of entertainment

listening to or viewing such a broadcast, but it is more an educational type. In our opinion the entertainment broadcast is something such as the Eddie Cantor Show and Ed Sullivan, and so on.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the question Mr. de Grandpre was asking you is, do you consider that the national service provided by the Government, as you recommend, is equally applicable to the entertainment type of programme as well as to the education type?

MR. HOME: Yes, I would say from my knowledge of what broadcasts I have seen -- there are some programmes which you can take as being both educational and entertaining at the same time.

THE CHAIRMAN: What it comes to is, do you think the Government should be providing entertainment, or should it mainly be providing education?

MR. HOME: I think the fact they have control of the airways, they have to meet both problems.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You also suggest a little further down that the work of the Corporation should be reviewed every five years but that Parliament should have the opportunity of questioning the accounts of the Corporation every year, and it has been repeatedly discussed before us that if the Corporation is to fulfil its duty it must be in a position to budget its expenses over a long period of, say, five years or four years, but it should not be subject to living ona day-to-day or year-to-year basis, and I am wondering whether this questioning of the accounts, at each session, would go as far as to make it a yearly grant or whether it would only be done as a closer check of the expenses incurred in opposition to the future budgeting?

MR. HOME: The reason for raising the question, sir, is that there has been some objection that

the accounts of CBC are not reviewable by Parliament, and our suggestion is that money has been spent in the previous twelve months and should be subject to question by members of Parliament, not exactly a yearly budget, but that any public moneys spent, the members elected should have the right to question.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am not sure of this, but I believe that today the accounts of CBC are submitted each year and are audited by the Auditor General and so on. I haven't any information, but one of our members raised that, and it was his understanding and he asked that be put. What about that, Mr. Keddy?

MR. KEDDY: The Auditor General has a representative in our offices at all times. It is a permanent audit.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Yes, but are the accounts tabled in the House?

MR. KEDDY: They are tabled in the report of the Auditor General each year; in the Blue Book.

MR. HOME: I will accept that statement.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are just after the facts.

MR. de GRANDPRE: I understand that clears your point?

MR. HOME: That is right.

MR. de GRANDPRE: As to the next paragraph you say the geographical position of British Columbia is such that the area is served by one television station, CBC controlled, and by four American channels, and you say you should not give any other choice to the people of British Columbia because they would receive exactly the same type of programming. Is this a fair interpretation of this paragraph, or do you go further, or not as far as I go?

MR. HOME: I think we could go as far. First of all, I think the evidence which has already been submitted, that 80 per cent of our population is in the lower mainland area and it has much easier access to the United States through Blaine than it has to the rest of Canada over the Rocky Mountains, and you will find in the lower mainland a tendency to accept American ideas and look to American entertainment. We say at the present time the number of television viewers in British Columbia have the chance of looking at the American stations, and we believe if a private station was set up in British Columbia it would merely duplicate the types of programme coming over the four American stations.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Assuming that private stations would be prepared to obtain a licence in the Vancouver area or in the immediate vicinity at no cost to the people of Canada, and with a further proviso that they would have to give a certain proportion of Canadian programming, what would be your attitude towards such a proposal?

MR. HOME: We are still of the opinion that if they were given that right that types of program would be contrary to the basic concept of retaining national control of broadcasting, which is to have some effect on developing Canadian culture and on Canadian programmes as a truly Canadian nation. The impact of television on public minds is of tremendous weight and we would be strictly concerned if a private station in British Columbia were established, again having that impact on the public mind in Canada which has already been exercised by the American radio stations.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Yes, but it has been

repeatedly told to us that the private radio stations have fulfilled in the past a local community service: would you not think that the same pattern could probably develop with the private television station and be in a position to make wider coverage of local news and events of local interest? I am always assuming it will be at no cost to the public.

MR. HOME: According to the submission made at the Canadian Labour Congress, they suggest within the submission that the private stations have not lived up to their commitments. In other words, the private stations in Canada have attempted to get by with the minimum requirements of meeting the regulations, and that on the whole they have not performed the function that is laid out in the policy for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, and they also suggest in the submission to the Commission that the CBC have not enforced the regulations in regard to those particular sections.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Do I take it from your answer that you do not agree with the statement that has been made to the Commission before that the private stations have played a role in local community service?

MR. HOME: I cannot say they have not played a role, because one particular station has performed a service to the Labour movement in this particular city, but I am suggesting the role has been a minimum one rather than the full role they could have played. I would not be prepared to accept the fact that if we give them a private TV station they would turn over a new leaf. I think it would be still from the strictly commercial point of view.

MR. de GRANDPRE: But you are leaving out one of my assumptions, that they would be asked to

keep a certain level of programming.

MR. HOME: Yes, I didn't leave that out, because I made that reference, that they are asked now under the radio broadcasting to maintain that, and according to the submission made by the Canadian Labour Congress they do not live up to that commitment they have made to the CBC, and they criticize the CBC for not enforcing the regulations.

MR. de GRANDPRE: That leads us to another point of your brief about enforcement of regulations. Do you have any suggestions as to better enforcement of the regulations? Do you think it should be done the way it is done, by the same people, but with greater care,or should it be done by another department of the CBC?

MR. HOME: On page 11 of the submission of the Canadian Labour Congress they said, "The Board of Governors should establish its own enforcement branch charged with enforcing the Board's regulations and responsible directly to the Board of Governors. In this way it would be obvious that the Board of Governors is the regulating and controlling body governing all broadcasting, public and private, in Canada and that it has the power to enforce its own regulations upon those public and private broadcasters in Canada."

MR. de GRANDPRE: So I take it that your section of what is now the Canadian Labour Congress, or will be the Canadian Labour Congress, has no regional suggestions to make?

MR. HOME: That is correct.

MR. de GRANDPRE: And we can rely on the submission made by the Congress in Ottawa?

MR. HOME: Correct, sir.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: In the course of your presentation you expressed doubt as to the wisdom of permitting a further television station in Vancouver because of the fact that it would immediately duplicate the programmes that are now being sent into us from the United States. If they are going to listen to the duplication in Canada they would not be listening to the one in the United States, but the point I want to bring out now is that the private broadcasters this morning presented us with a very substantial list of Canadian advertisers who, by reason of the fact there was no television station here, had to go down to Bellingham and broadcast from there. There is an advantage, at least an economic advantage, to Canada to retain those advertising dollars in Canada rather than have them go out. Would you place any emphasis on that submission for the purpose of getting an alternate station here?

MR. HOME: Yes, I think in the submission of the private broadcasters they gave the Commission no assurance that that money would be retained in Canada. In my opinion the Bellingham station, being rather limited for commercial purposes, would still be beamed to British Columbia and there would be a competitive price rate war set up, and at the same time dependent upon where the viewing public of British Columbia was going to listen. If it was going to listen to Bellingham or Seattle it would be necessary for the Canadian producers to advertise over those stations if he wanted his message to reach the public. I think there was no assurance that by setting up a station that people in Vancouver and vicinity would automatically view from that station.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am not technically able to discuss the strength of the signals that you would

get from one station or another, but it would seem to me logical that if a station were beamed from Vancouver the reception in Vancouver would be much better than from Bellingham or Seattle, and as a result I would think the advertising dollars going down to the States to be beamed back here could be retained with any small amount of salesmanship at all for that Canadian station, and it is a point of view we would all have to give some consideration to, I think, in this question of an alternative station here if, in fact, there is a matter of $300,000 to $400,000 a year being spent down there.

MR. HOME: I would say it would call for some consideration, but at the same time I think the major reason for TV would be to be in competition with CBUT which is laying out quite a heavy sum of money to provide TV service to the people in the lower mainland. It is a question of whether it is economically feasible with the present population.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: CBU, here now with television, are not getting in on the advertising dollar at all, so if there is something like $300,000 or $400,000 a year going down to Bellingham, without any knowledge of what it costs to run a television station, I would think it would be economically feasible with that amount of revenue.

THE CHAIRMAN: One question arising out of that, Mr. Home: if, as you suggested a moment ago to Mr. Stewart, there would be a very heavy "war" between Bellingham station and the new private station here for this advertising and for the listeners, wouldn't each have to make their programmes more attractive and presumably offer more employment to Canadian talent?

MR. HOME: That is one of the questions asked earlier regarding the commitment being made by private stations and the employment of Canadian live talent, and I think the record shows that they haven't been too high in that rating, and the suggestion would be that there would still be a lot of canned television broadcasting put over the private stations rather than employment of local Canadian talent.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. de Grandpre's question, at least, was on the basis that there would be certain Canadian originations, and I would take it from your Union's point of view that would be a good thing?

MR. HOME: Certainly we would support it.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: May I ask you the same question but from a different angle: page 2 of your brief, the second paragraph to the last, you say:

> "Television is costly, and therefore is only available to the well-financed concerns for advertising purposes. Canada is already in the main economically controlled by a few monopoly concerns and to allow the airways to be taken over by them, through their financing of the programmes, would subject the people to a restricted view of the issues of the day."

Perhaps we will not all agree with your view that Canada is in the hands of a few monopoly concerns, but let us assume you are right: there is only one

TV station in Vancouver now, CBC owned and operated, and likewise in Winnipeg, and while we were in Winnipeg the representatives of the Chamber of Commerce and other spokesmen of groups interested in the securing of a television licence for private interests, represented to us that because of a single outlet in Winnipeg only big national advertisers, which in your mind would be monopoly advertisers, could reach the Winnipeg market and were not giving the local businessmen or manufacturers a chance to get on their own local markets, and this morning, as Mr. Stewart will recall, the same representation was made to us by the local representatives that there was a long waiting list at CBUT because time requirements do not permit of those who wish to advertise securing time on that station, and therefore CBUT only uses national advertising. Would you think it would be desirable if a more liberal policy of granting TV licences were adopted throughout the country, particularly in cases like this, enabling local, small or medium sized businesses or manufacturers or enterprises -- call it what you like -- to reach the local market and more or less fight those big Canadian monopolies, as you call them, or at least hold their own against them? What do you think of this idea?

MR. HOME: We will deal with the question of Canadian monopolies: I think regardless of which particular field we go into, but take the meat packing industry, there are about three large concerns, and those concerns have particular branches in British

Columbia, and they are also the major outlets; I think in the question of the majority of foods we come up against the same particular question, and these are the people who use the air-ways, and there is the question of arbitrary rights, and depending upon the audience, and there is a limited amount of people in the lower mainland of British Columbia,and if you have a number of television stations beaming to these people, then the messages are not reaching the overall in competition, and eventually it would be a war against the CBC which has two reasons for existence: one is -- and the major reason -- to perform a service to the people of Canada, and if they are doing that, they can't meet up with this commercial war on the question of rates for advertising, and that is one of the dangers. There is a limited number of people in British Columbia.

THE CHAIRMAN: In this Exhibit 73, the list of sponsors on the Bellingham stations, the first one is Canada Safeway Limited; that is an international organization. Super-Valu Stores, Limited?

MR. HOME: It is becoming a very large concern,whether or not it is now tied up with a national concern I don't know, but they are certainly a large concern and buying up much property in Vancouver.

THE CHAIRMAN: What about Black Motors?

MR. HOME: I would say that is a local concern.

THE CHAIRMAN: Campbell Motors?

MR. HOME: The same thing.

THE CHAIRMAN: McCormick's Biscuits -- that is national?

MR. HOME: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Dairyland Limited?

MR. HOME: Dairyland Limited is a co-operative.

THE CHAIRMAN: Harrison Clothing Limited?

MR. HOME: That is a local concern.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I don't want to go through them all, but there does seem to be a fair-sized sprinkling, at least, of local concerns which are, in fact, advertising on the Bellingham station, according to this information.

MR. HOME: There is no question about that. The information is correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Home.

MR. HOME: Thank you, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: There are a couple more briefs this afternoon and the first one is from Mr. Donald J. Partridge of Victoria.

SUBMISSION OF MR. DONALD J. PARTRIDGE

THE CHAIRMAN: We will start by marking your brief Exhibit No. 78.

EXHIBIT NO. 78: Submission of Donald J. Partridge.

THE CHAIRMAN: I see there is someone with you.

MR. PARTRIDGE: Yes, this is Mr. Vince Butler, Vice-President of the Musicians' Union in Victoria. First of all, I would like to -- I have had something brought home to me as far as the Commission is concerned -- I think you would be happy to hear it, that through the Commission touring the country they are getting not only the opinion of national organizations but of local organizations, and I think that is very commendable. This is a typical example; Mr. Home files his brief and that of the Canadian Labour Congress as endorsement and approval of the local organization; I am afraid in our case this is not true. Our brief is in direct opposition. Of course, if anyone is directly concerned the Musicians Union is, since there is quite a good number of musicians hired by TV stations. The only explanation I can give for this is, unfortunately, we as a local organization were not aware of the submissions of the CCL and our national representative of

this Congress did not see fit to produce the submissions. It is commendable that your Commission is touring the country to get the opinion of all organizations. National policy of an organization does not necessarily give the opinions of the local organizations, although they may be in the majority. That is the only explanation I can give for that.

Now, if I may read the brief through and then make my remarks afterwards. This brief, by the way, for the self-same reason I have just mentioned, is presented by myself personally; however, with the approval and the endorsement of the executive of local 247 of the Musicians Union in Victoria. I will list the four submissions and then make my remarks.

"1. That the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation should not be permitted to monopolize and control radio and television in Canada.

"2. That a privately owned and operated national network for broadcasting and telecasting should be permitted without interference from or any control by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

"3. That if the Government of Canada intends to remain in a position of control in the fields of radio and television, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation should be divested of all authority with respect to radio and television and a new, separate body created to govern not only private enterprises in the field but also broad-

casting and telecasting by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

"4. That programme content should not be a matter of control or direction by the Government of Canada or any Government owned corporation, except in so far as any proposed programme might offend the laws or morality of Canada.

"1. That the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation should not be permitted to monopllize and control radio and television in Canada:

"It is not suggested that the Government of Canada relinquish radio and television as a matter in which the government is interested both in business and national concern. It is submitted only that competition from private enterprise should be permitted on a national basis. The urgencies of competition can only result in the presentation to the Canadian public of radio and television programming of the highest calibre, designed to obtain and hold the interest of the people. As a natural adjunct, the Canadian public will benefit from a diversification of employment, a reduction of the cost of the present government sponsored national network, and a proper decentralization of programming. There seems to be a great

fear that private concerns are interested solely in radio and television as advertising media and that a private national network would flood Canadian radio and television with what are known as commercials. We do not believe this to be true, and are willing to concede only that if a national enterprise is willing to finance national entertainment, then that enterprise is entitled to present to the nation the factual statements that the sale of their produce is paying for the entertainment provided. It is submitted that the CBC, operating the only network allowed in Canada,is limited in the number of musicians, actors, entertainers, etc. it can employ. As a result the entertainment industry in Canada is being stifled and our entertainers are seeking greener, foreign fields in order to advance their careers.

"2. That a privately owned and operated national network for broadcasting and telecasting should be permitted without interference from or any control by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation:

"The value of competition is lost if control of the competition is vested in one of the competitors. Therefore, it is submitted that so long as the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation remains in the

radio and television business, it should not be permitted to retain its present position of authority. It is not sufficient that a separate body within the framework of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation be vested with control and only some form of entirely independent authority should be in a position to govern and regulate radio and television in Canada.

"3. That if the Government of Canada intends to remain in a position of control in the fields of radio and television, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation should be divested of all authority with respect to radio and television and a new, separate body created to govern not only private enterprises in the field but also broadcasting and telecasting by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation:

"There have been many words written about the man with his finger on the pulse of the public. Radio and television are a matter of national concern, and therefore they should present to the public the programs wanted by the public. It is not proper that one or two groups of persons centrally located should decide what Canadians want in entertainment. Private enterprise on a national basis will want to reach as much of the Canadian public as possible and from

financial necessity will do it and pay for it. For example, hockey in Canada is of great national interest, and in all hockey no thrill of sport exceeds the Stanley Cup Finals. Yet, although in the United States private enterprise is able to broadcast and telecast the baseball World Series in full, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has failed miserably to provide even semi-adequate national coverage of the Stanley Cup playdowns.

"4. That program content should not be a matter of control or direction by the Government of Canada or any Government owned corporation, except in so far as any proposed program might offend the laws or morality of Canada:

"There is no inherent right in any person to dictate what a Canadian citizen may or may not look and listen to, and private enterprise, interested in reaching the major portion of the public, will find out first what is wanted and then provide it. Here can the loss of so many Canadian stars in the entertainment field be prevented. What a farce it is that the Canadian public must reach an American station to watch Canadian entertainment.

"In the past the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has been unsuccessful in maintaining the interest of that part of the Canadian population whose radio and television receiving sets are capable of receiving American radio broadcasts and telecasts, and private enterprise on a national basis appears to be the only logical antidote to audience depletion from foreign programs."

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you wish to add anything at this time?

MR. PARTRIDGE: Yes, I have quite a few remarks, and if I may I shall make them as brief as I can.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you will just confine yourself to the issues.

MR. PARTRIDGE: If I might say so, this is extremely important to me, as a matter of fact, it means the difference between life and death as far as our careers in Canada are concerned. I started the ball rolling about six months ago to go across the line for the more freedom of opportunity that it presented, but fortunately I have been able to land a job in Victoria, you will pardon the commercial, playing six nights a week at the Strathcona Hotel as a pianist, and, therefore, I have been held here in Canada by that job. There have been many, many musicians and entertainers who have gone across the line for that reason. However, I have been fortunate in getting that job since the provincial government has a ban on live music in cocktail bars in B. C.. I mention this just to show you what controls and unnecessary restrictions can do to the career of a musician or entertainer. The whole thing, as far as we musicians are concerned, can be summed up in a very few words.

The fact is, if I, as a musician, go to the CBC for a job, they are limited in the number of men they can hire, and if they are all full up where else can I go? There just is not anything else. If,

however, I go across the line, which I seriously do not want to do, then they have the CBS, ABC and NBC and all the different networks and if I do not make it at one I make it with the other. That is actually freedom of opportunity.

THE CHAIRMAN: May I interject a question. You raised a question a moment ago as to where else you could go. Now, there are, I think, five private radio stations in Vancouver and a couple in Victoria, so you have some private activity which, if they were employing musicians, could use your talents.

MR. PARTRIDGE: That is right, sir, and they are hiring talent all right, but it appears to me that what we need here in Canada is billed stars. The biggest asset -- a lot has been said about financing and finance as far as television networks are concerned -- but the biggest assets in a television station, you may say, work out of the studio at night; it is not the microphones or the cameras, it is the entertainers, they are the biggest assets, and it seems to me that in order to compete with American stations we must put on big shows and build our stars in Canada.

Mr. Dunton made a statement just recently. Now, I have no quarrel with Mr. Dunton, he is probably a very nice gentleman, I only have a quarrel with the policy. He stated, and I believe this came out in the press and perhaps a gentleman can enlighten me as to whether he did make this statement. He said that they were doing the best they could with the talent available.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, he said the exact opposite. We asked him if he felt there was any limitation of talent and he said no.

MR. PARTRIDGE: Oh, I see, there was a lot available?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. PARTRIDGE: I am afraid I made a mistake on that, then. Well, it appears to me that in any case, regardless of what was said, the point is that we are losing a good number of our entertainers and our potential stars, we are losing them across the border, most recently of which is Giselle Mackenzie, Dorothy Collins, Allan Young -- he could have been the Jack Benny of Canada, I am quite sure. He is a good man and he could have been developed right here in Canada and have become a star. Naturally, most people in Canada are, and I notice in Victoria in particular through a recent survey, that only six per cent, and we are fortunate in Victoria in being able to watch a total of, I believe, six or seven channels; we have seven channels available and every one is good, and I believe only six per cent of the population was watching CBC.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Could you tell us why such talent as Giselle Mackenzie and Allan Young and others, having been formed in Canada and grown up here, left the country? Was there no employment for them or were the fields greener on the other side?

MR. PARTRIDGE: I believe I can answer that,

these private radio stations hire a certain amount of live talent but they cannot build stars; they are operating strictly on a local basis, and it stands to reason that Joe Blow's service station cannot afford to put on a big show like Toast of the Town or a big national network show. They simply cannot afford it. Private stations in order to operate successfully must be formed in a national network so they can attract national advertisers, and that is the only way we can have stars in this country.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: These people actually appeared on CBC for a time?

MR. PARTRIDGE: For a time they did, but there were greener fields. Is it not time that we got on the band wagon and started to develop possibly a private network to begin with, perhaps as the country grows and our population increases -- I realize a lot of it has to do with the lack of population in this country, but is it not time we started to build them and the private networks can do that.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: What greater advantage would a private network have over the CBC network to keep these people here?

MR. PARTRIDGE: Actually we have no quarrel with the CBC whatsoever. As a matter of fact, in the past year they have improved tremendously, they are doing a terrific job, but the point remains there is still a lack of employment. Therefore, if there was another network competing with the CBC, they would be competing with shows, in the shows them-

selves, the stars would be competing with each other, the two networks, and when you get competition like that you get better and better shows because one is trying to outdo the other.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the question is this, relating directly to the loss of Canadian talent to the United States, if stars were already on one national network and are not able to be held here then why do you think that because you have two national networks that the available total of advertising dollars spread between the two instead of being confined to one -- you think that would be any better to help them? Is not the truth of the matter that you are competing against very real and very large markets in the United States for television?

MR. PARTRIDGE: That is true.

THE CHAIRMAN: And is not that the basic reason, and not the fact of whether private people have networks or have not?

MR. PARTRIDGE: I agree, the point is in that case that I do not think we will get the stars back who have gone to the United States and have gone to greener fields and have got the substantial increases in income; I do not think they will come back, they will not come back for less money. But the point is if there is enough freedom of opportunity in this country whereby they can further their careers at possibly less money than they might get across the line, why it is going to help to hold them here, they are going to think twice about going across the

line if they have something here which they can rely on, and which is furthering their careers. It is very difficult. I have been trying to get on the air in my own home town for ten years and it is like batting your head against that wall. It is very difficult, and we believe that the only answer is more freedom of opportunity along those lines.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does that pretty well cover everything?

MR. PARTRIDGE: There was, I believe, some comment about national -- perhaps national TV on a national basis, private TV, and the programmes becoming a little degrading. I think the only degredation you may have is perhaps in the commercials. A typical example of that is a station in Seattle, which has been mentioned before, KLAG, which was the first television station in Seattle, and they had a national hook-up. These commercials which came over on a national basis on programmes like G.E.Theatre, those commercials were very interesting and very informative. I don't know whether you gentlemen have seen the G.E. Theatre programme, but the commercials I find very interesting and very informative, and others are more or less amusing. Some are pretty awful, but, at the same time, most of them on a national basis are either very informative or amusing.

KLAG lost their network affiliation which they had previously, and I believe they still have ABC affiliation, but they don't have direct affiliation; that is to say, their ABC programmes are taped and put on later at a more convenient time. In that case, now that they have lost their network affiliation, their station is flooded with small spot commercials one right after the other. Well, that is degrading, and that is why I say that on a national basis these commercials would not be so degrading. They would be more informative, put on by a national concern, and I think most advertisers, national advertisers, feel and know that the public does not care for these

degrading commercials.

I might just make a mention here of one point you may be interested in: we seem to follow a great deal the British way and the ways of England, and I would like to read, if I may, an article written by a London correspondent, Wallace Reyburn, just recently,after commercial TV came into England:

> "London: The British are out of prison. They are no longer chained to the monopoly of the BBC. And as I watched with groups of them the first commercial programs ever to be put out over the air in Britain they were certainly like a bunch of just released prisoners savoring the delights and excitements of being out in the big wide world.
>
> "The coming of commercial television is a matter of great National importance. For thirty years -- in fact from the very beginnings of radio for the public -- folks here have been fed over the ether by an organization dedicated not to pleasing the people but to pleasing themselves.
>
> "Overnight, as if by magic, the British are now getting programs from outfits bending over backwards to give them what they want. Where the BBC was pompous, ponderous and

significant the commercial boys are bright, breezy and slick. And the British love it. It is so interesting to see all those arguments the British used to put up against commercial radio and TV go by the board."

As I say, this is not my opinion; I am merely quoting.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think you are right in one respect, that either we follow Britain or Britain follows us, and you can get any variety of opinion on that subject.

MR. PARTRIDGE: That is quite true.

MR. BUTLER: I think what Mr. Partridge was getting at here is this matter of employment with us. We come out of Victoria depending on how we are going to play it -- up or down. There is somewhere between 100,000 and 150,000 people in Greater Victoria, which is not too impressive a total, but it is unquestionably one of many cities in Canada. There are only a few large cities. You asked about the local stations employing local talent; one of our local stations employed as much and more different talent than the CBC. We think they are doing a job very well. In fact, we know they are. We haven't got Trans-Canada stations. We have the Dominion network station which seems to be the crux of this whole matter. We have a symphony orchestra which, according to far more qualified people than I, like Dr. McFarland and Sir Ernest Macmillan, ranks

right up there now. That orchestra has been on the tapes; they ran 13 takes, but it has never been on live. It is in Victoria and there is no Trans-Canada station. I am not too sure of the rules, but I don't think the CBC can have CJVI throw out their advertising programmes and put on a symphony. I believe they are an independent Dominion Network station. CJVI cannot put the Victoria Symphony on the air, nor can any radio station, in a city that size, and Mr. Partridge is trying to say that the radio and television business interests us more than anybody, perhaps, because it gets back to entertainment and music all the way, and to do the job right you need a lot of dollars. You cannot get them at once, and you have got to have the chain. If CJVI was part of a national chain I think you could get a firm such as Westons to pick up the Victoria symphony. Today there is nobody in Victoria who can sponsor the Victoria Symphony.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am glad you raised this point because I did want to ask a question about your fourth item in the brief which says:

> "Programme content should not be a matter of control or direction by the Government of Canada or any government-owned corporation . . ."

Please understand I have not accepted this; I am merely putting a case to you that has been put to us, that you are asking for a national television privately owned system, and you are saying there should be

no programme content control. It has been stated to us, and we will have to check all these kind of things, and I mentioned this a day or two ago, but I don't think you were here, that large musical programmes, not of the biggest sort but of a fair-sized sort, cost $30,000 to produce in the United States. A somewhat similar thing with perhaps less expenditure of money can be produced for $10,000 or $15,000 here. We have been told that you can buy the Canadian rights of the American programme for $2,000. Now, if you have your proposition of a national television private network without programme control operating on a commercial basis, and you were running it, which would you do -- what kind of employment are you going to get for your musicians?

MR. PARTRIDGE: I fully agree. Unfortunately I wasn't aware of these figures as to what the Canadian advertisers or stations could get the American programmes for. Probably we should withdraw that, but the only reason I put that in there was that there seemed to be a certain amount of people in Canada who are worried that the sponsor of a programme would have an effect, or, shall we say, would influence the programme content, and I don't believe that to be true; that is, that the sponsor would influence the programme content. That is the reason I put that in. Actually, since you have mentioned this point, it probably should be deleted.

THE CHAIRMAN: No. 4?

MR. PARTRIDGE: Yes. The point I would like

to make, I remember seeing a programme called Meet the Press, and it was Adlai Stevenson, and he was thoroughly embarrassed by the reporters. He had quite a time regaining his composure, and that to me is a typical example, when a political man like that can be embarrassed like that, that the sponsor of the programme is not going to have any influence on what is done or said on the programme, and that is the reason I put that in -- not for any other reason.

THE CHAIRMAN: I was only putting to you these other things that have been put to us to test your recommendation as to no programme control or as to Canadian content because I am sure we all have sympathy with the desire of musicians to stay in Canada and get employment in Canada, and I am asking you whether you have given it any thought as to whether or not the proposals you have put forward will, in fact, get you more employment.

MR. PARTRIDGE: All I can say is that I definitely agree. I do not have all the facilities at my fingertips, which you gentlemen have, and the information and everything. I realize that probably one or two of the things we have mentioned here will have to be modified if you do implement them, and the proposals I make are merely a sincere effort on our part to help you gentlemen arrive at a decision.

THE CHAIRMAN: We appreciate that. At the top of page 2 you make the statement:

"The urgencies of competition

> can only result in the presentation to the Canadian public of radio and television programming of the highest calibre, designed to obtain and hold the interest of the people."

Is that just a general statement? We have had it put to us that the exact opposite is the case -- similarly unsupported, I may say.

MR. PARTRIDGE: I might mention here there has been a certain amount of controversy in the United States about this. Here is a statement made by Mr. Crosby which says:

> "The pugnacious competitiveness not only between networks but between different shows on the same network have consistenly raised TV standards and will raise them further."

That is, that competition and free enterprise, which, after all, is the basis of our democracy, will raise standards of TV programmes throughout the country. Competition will do that if it is left to find its own level.

I am a music teacher myself, and if a music teacher opens up across the street from me it will keep me on my toes, and I am going to try to build my business and make it better all the time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I take it it is a general consideration of competition you are putting forward there rather than any specific information you have in the radio and television field?

MR. PARTRIDGE: It is just competition, that is all, so that there will be more opportunity afforded to entertainers and musicians as a whole.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you any personal contacts with the form of labour musicians contracts in the broadcasting programme field?

MR. PARTRIDGE: I don't quite understand what you mean.

THE CHAIRMAN: Union contracts?

MR. PARTRIDGE: Contracts for individual musicians?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, contracts by the Musicians Union with the, let us say, CBC or private stations.

MR. BUTLER: What was the question about the contracts?

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it is one of the points we have to inquire into and we have no information on it at present and I was wondering whether we could get some information from you. At one time in our questioning we were going at the problem of cost of the CBC and we raised the question -- two factors, really; whether because of our relatively small market in Canada we could not seek markets for our good musical programmes by exporting them as we do many commodities; and the second point was whether on the very expensive programmes it was not possible to, so to speak, spread the cost of a very expensive programme over several performances by repeating them. We were told that the provisions of the Labour contracts were such that it was almost impossible to

export because of the prohibitive higher rates that are paid if the programme is exported, and similarly much higher rates would have to be paid if programmes were repeated. I don't want to ask you something you don't know about, but if you do I would like your comments on those points.

-

(Page 1886 follows)

-

-

-

MR. BUTLER: If you write a book or a play and sell it to me I pay you a fee; if you sell it to everybody in this room you have got that many times that fee. It is standard practice, and it follows that if the musician is broadcasting, whatever it happens to be, if it is exported to another country it will have twice as many listeners and leaving the CBC out for the moment and working on a theory, and if the government-owned monopolies do not fit in with private enterprise theories, very well, but we have to refer back if it was some national advertiser presumably he is going to get twice as much money for the programme. I mean, that is the way the thing is started, is it not?

THE CHAIRMAN: Do not ask me, I am trying to find out.

MR. BUTLER: Well, that obviously is, it is a matter of how much money that girl's voice is going to make for his sponsor and the radio station, the radio station and advertiser are using somebody else, something somebody else has got to sell, some product or some radio time, and it follows if you are going to sell twice as much the person is in a position to ask twice as much. That has been a rule in private enterprise for a long, long time.

I will grant that you can be in a position like the CBC where you are dealing with something that is not so, and it might appear in a different light.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, the only point of the question is, we are wondering whether these rules can be restricting and keeping down the employment of musicians and other artists might have, and I am not going into the detailed policies here, but I

am really raising it as a point worthy of consideration because we have heard of your desire to get more employment and it may be this rule is one thing that is inhibiting your employment.

MR. BUTLER: I think if and when there is an entirely different set-up for radio and television in Canada you will find a lot of these rules that the musicians have will be reviewed and will be repealed. With the lack of competition that there is now in the field there are probably, as I say -- and I am speaking strictly on a personal basis, I cannot speak for the Musicians Union as a whole in Canada -- but I think probably if the whole question of television is to be reviewed in Canada and an entirely new set-up put in there will probably be a complete review of all the rules in the Union, and it will all be gone into. I cannot say what is going to happen or how it is going to be brought about, but it seems to me that the rules we have right now are put in for the system that we have right now.

THE CHAIRMAN: That does not necessarily mean they are good rules?

MR. BUTLER: Mind you, the point is that the lack of employment amongst musicians right at the present time -- the lack of employment, naturally we are trying to get all we can for musicians as it is, whereas if the employment field was opened up and there was more employment for musicians in all likelihood we would -- I am not saying we would or would not and I cannot speak on a national basis -- but, as

I say, I think these rules were put in based on the system that we have now.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, take the system you have now, we are told that something like, I think it is 50 per cent of the CBC national television programmes are produced in Canada of which a substantial part of it must be music and, they say, that is all they can manage to do having regard to the size of our market. If you could stretch that market by export then maybe the percentage could rise to 75 per cent, which would obviously mean more musicians employed in Canada, would it not?

MR. PARTRIDGE: That is a point which would have to be argued on a national basis, I am not at liberty to mention it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I just wanted to raise this now. Thank you very much.

MR. PARTRIDGE: Thank you very much for your time; we do appreciate it.

SUBMISSION OF OVERTURE ARTISTS AND CONCERT MANAGEMENT

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand that Mr. George Zukerman will be presenting this brief. Mr. Zukerman, I think we will have to ask you, since your brief came in more or less at the last moment, to go through it as quickly as you can.

MR. ZUKERMAN: I certainly shall.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will mark your brief as Exhibit 79.

EXHIBIT NO. 79: Submission of Overture Artists and Concert Management, Vancouver.

MR. ZUKERMAN: I appreciate the lateness of the hour and I do want to explain to you how I as a private individual decided to take the action in submitting a brief to the Commission. It has been very often said that the CBC represents a unifying cultural element in the country and because of the particular activity in which I am engaged at the present time with overture artists and concert management, I have come to a very strong realization of this fact; it is a little vague, and yet I think the evidence I have is worth submitting to this Commission of the very valuable benefit of CBC broadcasts throughout the country. We are engaged in presenting concert series throughout the remoter points of British Columbia and ultimately we will go into Alberta and Saskatchewan. I know from the letters I have received, and I have many of them here which I can show to you but I will not take the time with them, that this would be completely impossible were it not for the preliminary groundwork which the CBC has laid in broadcasting our better musicians over the air in chamber music and solo broadcasts. I speak for a very limited number of the musical artists; I speak for the solo artists and for the chamber music ensembles, certainly groups that could be our very finest experts and also in terms of going to the states, this limits the people I represent or for whom I speak.

Then, having something to do with the last

brief that we heard I,on page 3 or 4,refer to the fact that the artists of whom I am speaking, chamber music artists and solo artists, are not seeking greener fields; we are creating work for them here, and this work has been created very much on the basis of the fact that the smaller communities throughout British Columbia from places with a population of 300 or 400 people, to Nelson and Revelstoke, have been hearing our solo and chamber ensembles on the CBC. I do say that I feel the present policies of the CBC in terms of control and in terms of broadcasting our live talent ought to be maintained.

I can only give you as an example the situation in Nelson, which has now access to a regular CBC station, it has a Trans-Canada network, but it does not carry all programmes and in White Rock, which is very close to Vancouver and they pick up the local station of the CBC, I am not necessarily looking for an easy job because we have organized both towns and the response to this series is better where there are not as many opportunities to hear the Canadian artists.

Now, if I may read from the brief, I have to start out with a commercial, I am afraid, because no one knows who we are.

-

-

-

-

"Overture Artists' and Concert Management is a Vancouver agency, founded in 1954, currently engaged in promoting concerts by a number of leading Canadian soloists and ensembles both in Canada and the United States, and also engaged in the organization of British Columbia communities for regular concert series, featuring these and other artists. As a result of this activity, Vancouver concert artists have, during the past year performed publicly as far East as Swift Current, Saskatchewan, as far North as Williams Lake, B.C., and South to Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana. The Community of Nelson, B.C., which prior to last year had no organized concert life, received a series of four musical events during the past season, and for next year, White Rock and Revelstoke, as well as Nelson, will have similar series, with the possibility that Williams Lake, Kitimat, Duncan and Oliver-Osoyoos will similarly be developing their musical horizons. Up to this past year, such community organization had been handled exclusively by two large U.S. agencies, civic and community concerts, and now for the first time these organizations are offering to present Vancouver artists on their community series.

"Overture maintains that much of this recent development in local concert life is attributable to the regular concentration of the CBC on musical programming, and therefore

wishes to present this brief from the point of view of concert solosits and members of chamber music ensembles from this region, who are today experiencing vast new opportunities on an ever widening musical horizon.

"The concert artists and solosits of British Columbia represented by Overture have a vital interest in the maintenance of the current (or improved) level of CBC musical activities. The reputation of most of the Artists presented by Overture to some of the more remote parts of the province, and even beyond B.C. boundaries, has primarily been initiated through liberal CBC policies as to broadcasting Canadian musical talent not only in a single metropolitan center but from various locations across the country. No city in the United States, the size of Vancouver, would have the opportunities for solo, chamber music, orchestral and instrumental broadcasts that are available here through the CBC. However, it is not simply that the artists now being heard throughout the province have been introduced to their present public through the CBC. The very nature of CBC music programmes has established music as a natural part of the nation's cultural life, and made the initiation of concert series more in many a small community a practical reality.

"As yet, to many smaller communities, the CBC is the only concert stage. But as the

nation grows, and of course we are in the middle of a tremendous growth, these towns and areas will look towards live concert activity. Already, to others, the CBC has been the source of an introduction to concert life. The steady musical activity of the network has exposed them to many of the nation's top performers, and thus actively encouraged their own concert series organization. To the performer, too, the CBC represents a laboratory for public performance, reaching a vast audience with a high calibre of rendition and under controlled conditions. But the solo artist needs the concert stage as surely as a goldfish needs his pool, and the CBC should recognize that radio presentation of outstanding solosits and ensembles is not necessarily an end in itself (other than a purely economic one). If the CBC is genuinely interested, as it has proved it has been in the past, in maintaining and promulgating the musical cultural pattern which it has so successfully initiated across the nation, it should begin now to actively encourage the touring activity of soloists and ensembles who have appeared frequently on its programmes.

"Though much of the current concert life in British Columbia has been organized by the two large U.S. companies mentioned previously, a start has been made towards encouraging these organizations to present regional Canadian artists

as part of their series. Witness the inclusion this past season in the Civic Music Series of Kelowna, of a Vancouver woodwind ensemble -- and I have correspondence from people indicating how they heard about this ensemble -- a step directly attributable to the frequent broadcasts by this ensemble over the CBC. The logical continuation of such a step will be the inclusion of Canadian ensembles of such calibre in concert series under similar auspices in the U.S.A..

"(5) However, there are still areas which lack adequate CBC coverage, and therefore will ultimately suffer in their overall musical development. I might add these are probably the areas that are going through the biggest growth and most likely to be ready for their own concert activity in the next few years. Far from limiting CBC network activity, expansion would be the healthiest step from a musical point of view. We wholeheartedly support the plea of the Kelowna Arts Council for a CBC outlet in the Okanagan. It has been our experience that many residents of the Valley would wish for more intensive music and drama programming from the CBC on their local private stations. Such an outlet would undoubtedly increase the knowledge among the major communities of that area of the native Canadian and Canadian resident concert performers, and

presumably in the course of a very few years more of our artists would be included on the concert series organizations presently active in Kelowna, Vernon, Penticton and Kamloops under the aegis of the U.S. organization referred to above.

"A Vancouver newspaper is currently featuring a series in which it is claimed that U.S. interests are 'strangling the Northland', As we heard in earlier submissions to this Commission, this might be said to apply to radio, too, in the sense that in certain areas it is easier to pick up powerful U.S. stations than to tune in the CBC. And so it applies to concert life, which has just begun to reach out into this area, with an American concert series now serving Whitehorse in the Yukon. Would this have been otherwise had more intensive CBC coverage introduced our resident artists? There will be many a new community with which we shall soon find out.

"(6) As far as one can see, commercial radio cannot afford the production costs of solo and chamber music, let alone orchestral programmes. Certainly live music performance on the radio would be irreparably harmed by an abandonment of current CBC policies, with countless ill effects on the general musical life of the nation, particularly of the province, of course. I can only talk of British Columbia

with any knowledge. Because live music cannot pay its way on radio, does this mean that we should go without? We are frequently told that audiences do not want this kind of music, and that this is the imposition of the 'brain-trust's' standards, on the general public. We think that the phenomenal mushrooming of musical life in smaller communities is remarkable proof that this is not so. Communities of only a few thousand population find audiences of 400 and 500 turning out for concerts. Isolated towns of eight and nine thousand population aim at audiences of 800 -- almost ten per cent! One Okanagan city, Vernon, has a regular concert subscription of 1300 -- considerably above ten per cent of total population. Does this indicate disinterest in serious music? Yet the CBC is offering just the 'forespeis' of the concert life that will ultimately exist throughout the provinces of Canada, and year by year, more Canadian communities are coming of age and of size to begin enjoying their own concert life. No organization deserves more credit for laying a systematic foundation for such development than the CBC. In view of the nation's present growth, and the springing up of countless new communities, there could be no less opportune moment at which to consider any curtailment of CBC musical activity."

I suppose this would mean from my point of view financial outlay within the CBC, and I think it is wholly justified in terms of its musical expenditures.

"(7) There is yet another aspect of Canadian cultural life with which the CBC has perhaps unwittingly played a part. For the first time in this area, the cultural and musical flux which was heretofore characterized by a steady importation of American concert artists and groups to Canada has been reversed. Canadian groups and soloists are listed with major U.S. concert giving organizations, both community and civic, now list Vancouver Artists as available throughout the adjacent States, and are beginning to appear on concert series and college campuses throughout the Northwestern States. CBC broadcasts are well received in much of this area of the U.S.A., and these programmes have undoubtedly laid a groundwork for consideration of Canadian artists for U.S. series.

"(8) In a sense, then, the CBC unites Canada musically as no other force possibly could. Do CBC programmes represent a subsidy to musical art? Hardly. As far as the public is concerned, they are serving as an introduction to live concert activity which might otherwise lie dormant for many years. As far as those who perform on these programmes are concerned, it is a vital artistic opportunity not available in many another nation. It similarly is a prime economic and artistic reason why fewer musicians join the exodus southward which is so frequently apparent in other fields of

artistic endeavour. CBC should therefore be encouraged to continue and expand in full force its present musical policies, maintaining always the highest regards for the standards it promulgates."

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Zukerman. As you said at the outset, it is dealing with a very interesting but specific point.

MR. ZUKERMAN: So it is. Thank you very much; I welcome the opportunity.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is not because we are not interested that we do not ask questions, but you have made the point perfectly clearly and I have no questions.

MR. ZUKERMAN: I welcome the opportunity.

THE CHAIRMAN: That, ladies and gentlemen, completes the hearings ---

MR. JORGENSEN: If I may speak for a minute, Mr. Chairman, I was only notified yesterday that this Commission was in session, and I thought it was the practice of a Commission to have in the Canada Gazette proper notice, and also in the local provincial Gazette, but I did not see any notice of these hearings.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we certainly tried to give as many notices as possible, both advertisements in the newspapers, repeated several times, and appearances on television and radio.

MR. JORGENSEN: Yes. I have been very busy and I must have been deaf and dumb and blind.

THE CHAIRMAN: Whom are you representing?

MR. JORGENSEN: My name is Jorgensen and I am a local film producer. My evidence would be basically with unions and technical evidence in regard to standards.

THE CHAIRMAN: Haveyou a prepared brief or would you just speak?

MR. JORGENSEN: I would prepare a brief, and prepare it in the usual manner.

THE CHAIRMAN: In the circumstances we have really tried our best to let everybody know of this. It is unfortunate you did not know. We have had -- and I was just about to say -- quite a number of written submissions from the area from people who, for one reason or another, did not wish to appear. We propose to consider all these representations, and since your brief is not ready my only suggestion is that you should prepare it and send it in even though it is late according to our time table. It was supposed to be in by April 15, and the difficulty in this is -- we are not trying to cut off representation -- but you have to draw the line somewhere as a practical matter. I suggest what you do is, prepare your brief in as much detail as you like, send it in, we will read it and if there are any questions we need to ask you we will have to address them to you by mail.

MR. JORGENSEN: Yes, Mr. Commissioner.

THE CHAIRMAN: The alternative would be for you to come to Ottawa to present it later in

September, but I assume you don't want to do that.

MR. JORGENSEN: I, being an unsuccessful licencee applicant for many years, would like to present quite a lengthy brief, probably in four phases.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will be happy to receive it and give it consideration.

MR. JORGENSEN: When will you be sitting in Ottawa?

THE CHAIRMAN: In September. I think that is the only thing we can do as far as this is concerned, since, as I say, we have to draw the line somewhere.

MR. JORGENSEN: Yes, I do not want to take all the blame, as actually I feel the Royal Commission should follow the standard procedure laid down, and that is to notify in the Canada Gazette as well as in the provincial Gazette.

THE CHAIRMAN: This,I don't think, has ever been done.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, it is the standard practice as far as commissions go, to post notice in the provincial Gazette.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Order in Council appointing the Commission was published as all other Orders in Council are.

MR. JORGENSEN: But I don't believe the Order in Council would stipulate when the Commission was appearing.

THE CHAIRMAN: As far as we know, that is

not ever done, but, if it is, we didn't do it; that is a plain fact. I think we will have to leave it and you will be in touch with Mr. Pelletier, the Secretary of the Commission, who looks after the arrangements, and arrange between yourself and him the procedure it is possible to adopt.

Going on, as far as the public hearings in Vancouver are concerned, we have heard all those who have submitted briefs and wished to present them and comment on them publicly. We have had, certainly everyone will agree, a good mixture of opinion and we will have to consider all these as well as the recommendations that have been given to us in writing and not publicly heard. There are also the numerous studies we are having made, financial and otherwise, concerning radio and television broadcasting in Canada.

I think we will adjourn now, and I would like to thank those who have taken the trouble to come here and present these, and also those who have taken the trouble to come and show their interest by listening.

We will adjourn now, resuming in Edmonton next week.

---The hearings adjourned at 5.20 p.m.

- - - - - -

I N D E X

SUBMISSION OF:		Page
STATION CKWX, VANCOUVER (CONT'D)		1728
	Mr. F.G. Elphicke, Vice-President and General Manager	
VANCOUVER SYMPHONY SOCIETY		1757
	Mr. Robert Phillips, Business Manager	
GROUP OF CITIZENS FROM NANAIMO		1771
	Mr. W.R. Taggart, Librarian	
B.C. ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS		1788
	Mr. Maurice Finnerty Mr. C.J. Rudd Mr. Elphicke Mr. Seabrook	
B.C. FEDERATION OF LABOUR		1845
	Mr. Geo. E. Home, Secretary-Treasurer Mr. Bob Smeal, Vice-President	
MR. DON PARTRIDGE	Individual Brief	1864
OVERTURE ARTISTS AND MANAGEMENT		1888
	Mr. George Zukerman	

INDEX TO EXHIBITS

No.	Description	Page
73	List of Vancouver Sponsors of KVOS-TV, Bellingham	1749
74	Brief of Vancouver Symphony Society	1757
75	Brief submitted by Group of Nanaimo Citizens	1771
76	Brief of the Association of British Columbia Association of Broadcasters	1788
77	Brief of British Columbia Federation of Labour	1845
78	Submission of Donald J. Partridge	1864
79	Submission of Overture Artists and Concert Management	1889

ROYAL COMMISSION

ON

BROADCASTING

HEARINGS

HELD AT

EDMONTON, ALTA. MAY 22, 1956

v. 12

ROYAL COMMISSION ON BROADCASTING

Edmonton, Alberta,
May 22, 1956.

PRESENT:

THE CHAIRMAN	ROBERT M. FOWLER
COMMISSIONER	EDMOND TURCOTTE
COMMISSIONER	JAMES STEWART

- - - - -

COMMISSION COUNSEL	JAMES M. COYNE A. J. de GRANDPRE

- - - - -

SECRETARY	PAUL PELLETIER

- - - - -

SUBMISSIONS BY:

ALBERTA MINISTRY OF TELEPHONES
Hon. Gordon E. Taylor

ALBERTA FEDERATION OF HOME AND SCHOOL ASSOCIATIONS
Mrs. B. P. Marliss
Mr. W. E. Hodgson

FARMERS' UNION OF ALBERTA
Mr. A. W. Platt
Mrs. Olive Douglass

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
Miss M. MacKenzie
Dr. Walter Johns

RADIO-EDMONTON LIMITEE
Dr. L. P. Mousseau
M. Leo Remillard

ASSOCIATION CANADIENNE FRANCAISE de l'ALBERTA
M. Andre Dechene

LABOUR PROGRESSIVE PARTY - ALBERTA COMMITTEE
Mr. W. A. Tuomi

ALBERTA FEDERATION OF AGRICULTURE
Mr. Roy Marler
Mr. James McFall

Hearings of the Royal Commission on Broadcasting held at Edmonton, Alta., commencing on Tuesday, May 22, 1956.

---On resuming at 10.00 a.m.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, we will open the sittings in Edmonton and I want to begin by thanking the Mayor and Council of Edmonton for making arrangements for our hearings here. This is the first time I have sat in the mayor's chair, and it may be the last time, I am afraid. We are very glad to be here in Edmonton, and we have a number of briefs to hear today and tomorrow morning.

I should perhaps begin, as I have at most of the sessions, by explaining a little bit about our procedure. We try to get started about ten in the morning and run through until somewhere between 12.30 and 12.45, resuming after lunch and going through until about 4.30 or 5.00 o'clock. We ask those who are presenting briefs, if they are very short, to read them, or to summarize them as seems best to them. In all cases we have had the briefs and have read them. Following that

we address questions to the witness who is appearing before us, both from the Commission and from one or other or both of our two counsel who are present. The purpose of these questions is to get at the facts. As I have said many times, you can only examine one witness at a time, and the questions are to elicit the facts and may at times appear as if we were approaching it from the other side, as it were. This is not to be taken at all as any indication that the Commission has reached any conclusions. It will not reach any conclusions until it has heard all the evidence.

On that basis, if there is nothing more to add, we will begin, and I think the first brief we are to receive is from the Honourable Gordon E. Taylor, on behalf of the Alberta Ministry of Telephones. Mr. Taylor, we have your brief, and we will mark it to begin with as Exhibit 80.

EXHIBIT NO. 80: Brief presented by the Honourable Gordon E. Taylor, Minister of Telephones, Province of Alberta.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you proceed?

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman and members of the Royal Commission on Broadcasting, I would first of all like to take this opportunity of welcoming you to the Province of Alberta and trust that your stay here will be especially comfortable and enjoyable and that you will take back with you many happy recollections of the people of our province, and of our beautiful sunshine.

I have with me today, gentlemen, Mr. J. J. Crawley, Q.C., Special Counsel to the Alberta Government, who is sitting on my right. With your permission, sir, I would prefer to read the brief and possibly make some comments as we go alond.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will try not to interrupt you except for purposes of clarification as you go along, but we will have the questions after.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, sir. Mr. Chairman and members of the Royal Commission on Broadcasting:

"The terms of reference in the Order in Council P.C. 1955-1796, December 2, 1955, directs the Royal Commission on Broadcasting to examine and make recommendations upon:

(a) the policies to be followed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in its television broadcasting activities and the relation of such policies to the finances of the Corporation;

(b) the measures necessary to provide an adequate proportion of Canadian programmes for both public and private television broadcasting;

(c) the financial requirements of the Corporation for television broadcasting and the relation of these to the extent, nature, standards and distribution of programmes;

(d) the financial requirements of the Corporation for sound broadcasting in the light of the development of television and the

growth of population in new areas of Canada;

(e) the manner in which the finances for the television and sound broadcasting operations of the Corporation should be provided and managed;

(f) the licensing and control of private television and sound broadcasting stations in the public interest; and

(g) such other related matters as the Commissioners consider should be included in reporting properly upon those specified."

The first topic I would like to discuss is Federal Government Policy.

"From this reference it would appear that the Commission has been given the necessary authority to examine and make recommendations concerning the whole field of sound and television broadcasting. Presumably then, the policy of the Federal Government in this field, may also be reviewed, as the policy and regulations of the Corporation either originate or are approved around the table of the Cabinet at Ottawa.

"The Federal Government has by statute set up the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation with authority to operate radio stations across Canada, and to set out the rules whereby private stations may compete. In addition, the Corporation is then clothed with authority to regulate

the competitors. It is a jumble of socialism and free enterprise with the socialist side having all of the authority. It exhibits contempt for free enterprise. It gives totalitarian authority in the field to the Government Board and then permits -- maybe 'tolerates' would be a better word -- private stations; and the set-up is labelled private enterprise. In truth it is private enterprise chained by Government interference and shackled by a Government Board of Directors. The remarkable thing is that even under such working conditions the private stations have been able to do a reasonably good job in Canada. The job that has been done could have been done much better had free enterprise been permitted to function without this unwarranted government interference. But, the Federal Government policy is now even more contradictory than its legislation, if that is possible. The Government of Canada has taken authority itself to operate radio stations. The same Government has ordained that other governments in Canada must not be given equal or equivalent opportunities to operate. It is well and good for the Federal Government; it seemingly is evil and bad for provincial governments!

"The Federal Government says licences will not be issued to other governments or corporations owned by other governments. And

so the Board of Governors of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation meekly say 'Me, too!" and, irrespective of their own thoughts on the matter and in total disregard to evidence gathered, refuse (must refuse) every provincial application for a licence, even though such stations would compete with other private stations.

"If it is wrong for the elected Government of a province to merely operate a radio station, is it right for the Federal Government to operate its own stations and at the same time regulate and control private stations?

"The Government of Alberta submits that the present legislation should be changed, one, to give private stations an opportunity to function without Government interference, and two, to give all governments an opportunity to operate in fair competition with private stations, and three, to limit Government control of radio and television to the field of preserving order in the air lines.

"Now let us deal with one or two regulations of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation."

Regulation No. 14, which may be headed "Prohibiting Network Broadcasting":

"We deem this regulation as unwarranted and unnecessary interference. Let us look for a moment at the regulation, which reads:

"'14. (1) Except with the written

consent of the Corporation no station shall operate as part of any established chain or network of stations inside or outside Canada.

'(2) Except with the consent of a representative of the Corporation no station shall broadcast a program through network connection with another station or other stations inside or outside Canada.

'(3) Except with the consent of a representative of the Corporation no station shall broadcast any reproduced program or speech which would have the effect of simulating a network of stations not authorized on behalf of the Corporation.'

"This is an objectionable regulation. We would like to call one instance to the attention of the Commission.

"During the 1951 Session of our Legislature, a series of daily five minute talks -- three days by members of the Government and two days by members of the Opposition -- reporting upon the day's happenings in the Legislative Assembly were broadcast under the title 'Your Government Speaks'. The broadcast was first recorded on tape. No objection was raised when these reports were broadcast over the Edmonton Station CJCA alone. But when it was proposed to broadcast the reports simultaneously from CJCA and the Calgary Station CFAC, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation said 'no' presumably

because the proposal was regarded as network or chain broadcasting and accordingly prohibited by regulation 14 without the prior consent of the Corporation. In the result, the broadcast through CFAC Calgary had to be delayed three hours so as not to constitute network broadcasting.

"Our experience in connection with the daily reports from the Legislature is given merely as an illustration. The same situation could and presumably does arise from time to time. If there be a good reason for this restrictive regulation we have no knowledge of it. If it was permissible to broadcast the report to Edmonton listeners from CJCA, what conceivable objection could there be to allowing Calgary listeners to hear the report at the same time from CFAC?

"Another thing that is objectionable is that the prohibition is not absolute and unconditional but is subject, like so many other matters of the same kind, to the decision of the officials of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. What is the justification for that kind of interference in the management of the two private stations concerned in the illustration I have given? If there is nothing wrong about the broadcasting from two stations simultaneously -- and how could there be -- leave the local station managers free to make the arrangements necessary.

There is in our submission, no place for any in-between authority on the part of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to give or withhold consent in cases of this kind.

"Canadian stations should have the right to form Canadian networks either regionally or nationally.

"Regulation 5 G, respecting appeals for donations and subscriptions.

"Regulation 5 G reads as follows:

> 5. No station shall broadcast
>
> '(g) except with the consent in writing of a representative of the Corporation, any appeal for donations or subscriptions in money or kind on behalf of any person or organization other than
>
> (i) churches or religious bodies permanently established in Canada and serving the area covered by the station,
>
> (ii) recognized charitable institutions or organizations,
>
> (iii) universities, or
>
> (iv) musical or artistic organizations whose principal aim or object is other than that of monetary gain,'

"We submit that this regulation is completely unnecessary, that it threatens some fundamental rights of Canadian citizens, that it encroaches on the domestic affairs of private stations and that it is a violation of

the democratic right of our people to know.

"Let us examine the regulation in more detail: (a) We deplore the unnecessary interference with, and the encroachment upon, the rights of individual private radio stations. The regulation permits the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to exercise a large measure of control over matters which should be regarded as the purely domestic affairs of the local station. The regulation presumes the monopoly of wisdom in 'a representative of the Corporation' who must give his consent in writing before a local station may even permit an appeal for funds arising directly out of a sudden tragedy occurring in the local area. The Corporation may or may not have ever withheld its consent from any worthy cause. That to me is not the point. The important part is the principle which in essence says 'we give you a permit to operate a station but we cannot trust you to decide how to run your own business.' To illustrate: a flood or a fire renders a number of families homeless and a request is made to the local radio station to broadcast an appeal for donations in money and in kind for the immediate and urgent relief of the stricken people. Such a catastrophe is not uncommon and may occur in any community in Canada, almost without a moment's notice. Local newspapers continually open their columns to appeals

of this kind but the management of the local radio station must say, when requested to so so, 'I am fully sympathetic, I would like to broadcast an appeal, I am the owner of the station, I have a licence to operate, but I have to ask the Chairman of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation or one of his representatives for his prior consent in writing'. How ridiculous can regulations be! There is no necessity or common sense in leaving matters of this kind to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. It is a waste of time and effort and energy and money and there is not one reason that I have yet heard advanced that justifies this interference of a Government Board in private business. It is a serious infringement on the rights of private stations on the basic principles of private enterprise and illustrates the Corporation's trend towards bureaucracy. We would strongly recommend that your Commission, in no uncertain way, eliminate this practice and thereby permit individual enterprise to function without these ham-strings of unnecessary restrictions. A manager of any station in Canada is surely a person quite competent to judge the worth of the person or organization that may wish to appeal for donations or subscriptions over the air. He can familiarize himself with the nature of the organization and the need for public appeal.

He is familiar with local conditions. He lives and remains living in the same area. He has every incentive to do the right thing and must take the consequences of any wrong or unwise action. The local private station is more capable of dealing with such matters than is any representative of the corporation."

My second submission in connection with Regulation 5G:

"Furthermore, this regulation prohibits a church or a religious body to appeal for donations or subscriptions except in the area covered by the station from which the broadcast is made without having first obtained the consent in writing from a representative of the Corporation. On or about January 23, 1953, when a hearing was called by the Board of Governors of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation for the purpose of considering changes in the regulations, the words 'churches and religious bodies' did not then appear in the exceptions at all. In other words, the present 5 G (i) was conspicuous by its absence. At that time the Government of Alberta made strong and strenuous representations and urged that, at least, churches and religious bodies be placed in the exceptions. We gave the drafters of the regulation the benefit of a grave doubt in suggesting that, possibly, the omission of churches and religious bodies

from this regulation was an oversight. When the Corporation finally issued the regulations as approved, 5G(i) as it presently reads had been added. But our recommendation was accepted only in part as the restrictive words at the end of this regulation, namely 'and serving the area covered by the station' were added. We are sure that this Commission agrees that churches and religious bodies are not local in character. Religious convictions are the most basic part of our make-up and a conviction carries with it a desire to let others know the truth as we feel it and as we see it. It cannot be cornered in one country or in one section of a country. It is evangelical in nature and carries with it a universal appeal recognizing the final right of each and every individual to work for and support and believe in the church and doctrine of his choice. We prize all of our freedoms in this country, and certainly not least our freedom to worship as our own heart and mind dictates. And each and every one of these freedoms is based on the right of the people to know; by hearing all facts, all philosophies, all ideas, we form our own views and our own convictions. And no one ever lost out by hearing another's point of view. But here, this regulation requires that a representative from the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation must give his consent in writing before a

church or religious body may seek support from those of kindred beliefs who live beyond the signal of the home station! As such, it is a violation of the fundamental right to spread the Gospel or other religious beliefs. It is an echo of by-gone attempts to stop the spread of Christianity by trying to localize it, by placing restrictions, regulations and limitations upon the church. Surely it is not asking too much for us to grant the same opportunity to others who may believe in doctrines with which we do not agree, as we would want ourselves. No one need listen, no one need support -- but surely all should have the right to hear and support as their own mind dictates! Today, thousands of people in Canada worship in reverence in their own way in their own home beside their radio every Sabbath Day. Surely a regulation that prevents an appeal for support in order to continue to carry to them the message in which they believe is completely undemocratic. It is unwarranted interference. It threatens this fundamental right. I submit, gentlemen, that this type of regulation and attempt to control has no place in Canada and if the regulation is to be left at all, certainly the last eight words in 5G(i) 'and serving the area covered by the station' should be deleted."

We want to make it emphatically clear, however, that we think the regulation should be deleted entirely. Our third submission in connection with

Regulation 5G:

"This regulation threatens something else that is fundamental too, and that is the right of every Canadian to support any cause which he deems worthy of financial assistance. The Corporation through this regulation is endeavouring to tell Canadians how they may or may not spend their own money. 'Except with the consent in writing of a representative of the Corporation' an appeal for donations for any worthy cause cannot be made. This means, if it means anything, that a representative of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation can dictate the type of appeal that may be made. Canadians are not illiterate. Neither should they be treated like irresponsible children. Canadians are quite capable of deciding what causes to support with money or goods and should not be denied the opportunity of deciding themselves on the merits of any cause. This is again an unnecessary interference with the rights of individual citizens. It is a trend which reaches its apex under communist and fascist regimes where 'boards' decide what is good and what is bad for the people. We want none of that in Canada and this trend should be stopped immediately."

Our fourth submission in connection with Regulation 5G, and our final submission with respect to this regulation is:

"If the regulation is to be left at all,

that political parties should be included in the exceptions. It is our view again that, irrespective of the political stripe of the party in power that the people have a right to know and to hear all points of view and all philosophies and to contribute to the one or ones of their choice. This regulation which permits a Corporation which may be closely allied to the political party in power to literally keep other parties or organizations off the air is again approaching uncomfortably close to totalitarian thinking.

"The Government of Alberta submits that political organizations should not be required to obtain the consent of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in order to invite the voluntary financial support of citizens who are in accord with the aims and objectives of the party or organization concerned.

"The validity of our contention is rather emphasized by the fact that while Parliament has legislated on the subject of political broadcasting in various respects, it has not prohibited solicitations for money donations or subscriptions by political parties. The statutory provisions concerning political broadcasts are limited to:

'(1) prohibiting dramatized political broadcasts;

(2) requiring that the names of the sponsors and the political party on

whose behalf the broadcast was made shall be announced before and after the broadcast;

(3) prohibiting political broadcasts for two days immediately preceding election day;

(4) authorizing the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to make regulations prescribing the proportion of time to be devoted to political broadcasts and assigning such time on an equitable basis.'

"It can quite logically be argued that when Parliament was legislating upon this subject it would have prohibited political parties from broadcasting appeals for donations if it had intended that there should be such prohibition. It would have dealt with the matter clearly and directly and would not have left the matter to be prohibited in a negative manner by a regulation of the Corporation. Indeed it is our view and our submission that Section 22 of the governing statute does not confer upon the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation the authority to make any regulation which in effect prohibits appeals for donations by political parties. The only reference to political broadcasts in the regulation-making authority of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is contained in sub-paragraph (e) of Section 22 of the Act which confers upon the Corporation power to make

regulations for allocating and assigning broadcast time on a basis equitable to all parties. The power to make regulations upon this subject is limited to that aspect. All other aspects of political broadcasting have been dealt with by Parliament itself in Section 22 of the statute.

"We believe we have submitted ample reasons to show why we contend that this regulation should be struck out at the earliest possible time.

"Incidentally, in passing, we have difficulty in understanding why Parliament prohibits dramatized political broadcasts."

THE CHAIRMAN: It may just be a protection for politicians.

MR. TAYLOR: "We are convinced that the deletion of this section would enliven political broadcasts in Canada and that far more people would listen if there could be variations in political broadcasts.

"To sum up, the Government of Alberta strongly urges that the Royal Commission on Broadcasting give careful thought to the recommendations that we have made. We are convinced that the great majority of Canadians find the type of regulation and control dealt with as nauseating and objectionable as we. By and large Canadians are free enterprisers and they should not have free enterprise blotched and scuttled by acts of pure socialism handed out to the people in the name of free

enterprise.

"The Government of Alberta stands four-square for free enterprise, and jealously guards the rights and liberties of our people. We hope this Commission has these same objectives. It is our hope that your deliberations and studies will spell a new and better day for broadcasting and television in Canada.

"All of which is respectfully submitted."

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you wish to add anything more at this time, Mr. Taylor?

MR. TAYLOR: I think possibly I will leave it for the questions, and if it doesn't come out in the questions, I may add something.

THE CHAIRMAN: Feel perfectly free to add anything at any time. Mr. Crawley, have you anything to add?

MR. CRAWLEY: No, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is just one question before I ask our counsel to ask some questions: Am I right in thinking that the Government of Alberta either owns or controls and operates a radio station?

MR. TAYLOR: CKVA is operated by the Alberta Government Telephones, which is the department that I administer. The licence is in the name of the University of Alberta.

THE CHAIRMAN: I picked it up from one of the other briefs, but there is no mention of this station or its operations in your brief.

MR. TAYLOR: No, this is a brief of principle.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Taylor, in your opening paragraph you say, "Presumably then, the policy of the Federal Government in this field, may also be reviewed, as the policy and regulations of the Corporation either originate or are approved around the table of the Cabinet at Ottawa." A perusal of the Canadian Broadcasting Act would tend to indicate that the Corporation makes its own regulations and, subject to its overall responsibility to Parliament, determines its own policy; could you outline for us what you mean by this statement that the policy and regulations either originate or are approved by the Cabinet?

MR. TAYLOR: Yes, I would like to give the following illustrations to back up that statement. No. 1; in any country where you have responsible government, the government must take responsibility for the actions or acts of its own creations. Consequently, the Government at Ottawa must assume responsibility for the actions of the Corporation which it sets up. It would be inconceivable to think a government was going to take responsibility for actions which are completely contrary to its own policy.

Secondly, in the Broadcasting Act I would refer you to Section 12, which reads:

> "(1) The Corporation may make such bylaws as may be necessary
>
> (a) to enable it to carry into effect the obligations imposed

upon it by this Act,

(b) to provide for an executive committee of the Board of Governors to exercise such powers as the bylaws may specify,

(c) to provide for the appointment of advisory councils to advise it as to programmes,

(d) to provide for the employment, dismissal, control and remuneration of such officers, clerks . . ." etc.

Then, section 2 of 12:

"No such bylaws shall come into force or effect until approved by the Governor in Council . . ."

THE CHAIRMAN: I was going to say, that does not apply to regulations which are covered by Section 21.

MR. TAYLOR: I want to go a little further, sir. Again, Section 22 appoints the Minister of Transport in the following words:

"The Minister of Transport shall before dealing with any application for licence to establish a new private station or for increase in power, change of channel, or change of location of any existing private station, or making any regulations or changes in the regulations governing the activities of private stations, refer such application or regulation to the

Corporation and the Corporation shall give public notice thereof in the Canada Gazette and shall make such recommendation to the Minister of Transport as it may deem fit; the approval of the Governor in Council shall be obtained before any licence for a new private station is issued.

"(2) The Corporation shall each year review the activities of all private stations and shall make such recommendations to the Minister of Transport in regard to their working, broadcasting or any matter concerning such stations as it may deem desirable."

A further section in the Act appoints a Minister to be responsible for the Act. Under Section 2:

"'Minister' means the Minister designated by the Governor in Council for the purposes of this Act."

In addition, the Minister of Finance, under Section 14, is appointed to keep an eye on the finances of the Corporation. In addition to that the Minister is required to report to Parliament on the operation.

MR. COYNE: Which minister is that?

MR. TAYLOR: The Minister of Transport.

MR. COYNE: On the operation of the CBC?

MR. TAYLOR: The Minister of National Revenue, as presently named.

MR. COYNE: But not to report to Parliament. He is the mouthpiece.

MR. TAYLOR: He speaks with authority for the Corporation on the floor of the House of Commons, and his interpretations are certainly government policy, and the policy followed by the Corporation created by the government itself. I would submit, sir, that when you have in the Act power over the money of the Corporation, when you have the bylaws controlled by Orders in Council, and when you have at least two ministers of the Crown keeping a careful eye on the Corporation, that the policies and regulations of the CBC certainly constitute government policy. When I appeared before the CBC in connection with regulations in 1953, either the chairman or one of the governors made the statement that these matters would have to be discussed with the minister in charge.

MR. COYNE: Referring just to one of the sections which you mentioned in relation to government control, Section 22, you would agree,would you not, that that deals with licensing matters?

MR. TAYLOR: That is right.

MR. COYNE: And the CBC is not the licensing authority.

MR. TAYLOR: The CBC, sir and gentlemen, is the one that hears the representations.

MR. COYNE: And so ---

MR. TAYLOR: Now, if the recommendation of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is not going to be considered, why is all the hearing conducted by the Corporation?

THE CHAIRMAN: It is undoubtedly considered,

but it is not necessarily followed. In some cases it has not been followed.

MR. TAYLOR: Do you know of cases where the recommendation has not been followed?

THE CHAIRMAN: We have had those given to us, yes. It was a case in which a private station applied for a television licence and the CBC also applied for it, and the private station got it.

MR. TAYLOR: Well, I would think that would be right, but the point I am making is that the licensing -- at least, the intent of the question was that the Minister of Transport has full control over the licensing. Well, that is as it should be, but at the same time the Corporation certainly has a lot of influence in connection with licensing.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't know that it is of great importance. I think Mr. Coyne's first question to you was merely to be sure that we were thinking of the same thing about this sentence which said, "The regulations of the Corporation either originate or are approved around the table of the Cabinet in Ottawa." I think the only point in the question is that on the statute itself that is not the fact. The regulations, such as the regulations you are talking about later in your brief, are not, in fact, originated or approved around the table of the Cabinet in Ottawa. What you are saying now is that presumably they know about them and must approve tacitly.

MR. TAYLOR: I would submit that when the government controls the money and the bylaws and has

two ministers to watch over the Corporation, there is nothing passed that has not the approval of the Federal Government.

MR. COYNE: That is a presumption, though. You are not in a position to give us cases where there was Cabinet interference with the CBC in its policy or regulations?

MR. TAYLOR: Following representations to the Board of Governors in connection with Regulation 5G, in 1953, I later discussed this matter with the Minister of Transport, the Honourable Lionel Chevrier, and that very evening, although he was not at the hearing in the afternoon, he outlined to me reasons why these regulations were being put in the words they were.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before you leave that paragraph, Mr. Coyne, the first sentence reads:

> "From this reference it would appear that the Commission has been given the necessary authority to examine and make recommendations concerning the whole field of sound and television broadcasting."

You know, of course, that the quotation above in (a) to (g) is not the complete Order in Council that appoints us, and you may not perhaps have in mind the paragraph recital in the Order in Council P.C. 1796 of 1955 which appointed this Commission, which provided, "that the reconsideration of television broadcasting should be based upon the principles that the grant of the exclusive use of

certain frequencies or channels for broadcasting shall continue to be under the control of the Parliament of Canada, and that the broadcasting and distribution of Canadian programmes by a public agency shall continue to be the central feature of Canadian broadcasting policy." So, it is not quite as wide open as you suggest in this opening paragraph.

MR. COYNE: At the beginning of your next paragraph you say:

> "The Federal Government has by statute set up the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation with authority to operate radio stations across Canada, and to set out the rules whereby private stations may compete."

Again it has been represented to us, and a perusal of the Broadcasting Act would tend to support it, that the scheme of the Act is that there should be a single national broadcasting service, and the CBC is charged with operating such a service, within which the private stations play their part. Would you agree that as the Act is at present constituted that would be a fair statement of the scheme of the operation of the Act?

MR. TAYLOR: I would agree that the Act certainly gives authority to the CBC to set up a national station.

MR. COYNE: A national service?

MR. TAYLOR: A national service.

THE CHAIRMAN: It goes further than that. Section 8 says:

"The Corporation shall carry on a national broadcasting service within Canada . . ."

It is more than authority; it is a directive.

MR. TAYLOR: That is right.

MR. COYNE: Following on from that, Mr. Taylor, why do you say that this scheme or this system, if you like, exhibits contempt for free enterprise?

MR. TAYLOR: I would like to deal with that, sir. The first point I would like to make is that the Canadian Broadcasting Act carries with it the authority to set up a national broadcasting service. All of the authority is given to the Board to operate that national broadcasting service. The authority is then given to the Board to also hear the applications and permit private stations to operate under certain conditions.

MR. COYNE: Within the single service?

MR. TAYLOR: That is right, within the single service. In other words, the whole control, the whole picture is that the CBC has the authority to set up individual stations anywhere in Canada which, in effect, only serve local areas, exactly as other stations serve local areas, and at the same time to license and control those other stations with which it competes. Secondly, it shows contempt . . .

THE CHAIRMAN: You say that shows contempt.

MR. COYNE: Why contempt?

MR. TAYLOR: It shows contempt because the private station is not free to operate as it would

otherwise operate. It is under the control of a government board which itself operates other stations in competition with it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, you say it is contempt.

MR. TAYLOR: I believe it is contempt. Another point along the same line, I would like to refer to Section 11. One of the basic things in a free enterprise system is the right to hold property and the sanctity of individual property held. Here again you have something that I think is getting very close to socialism and again shows contempt for free enterprise.

Section 11(1) says:

> "No real property or private station shall be purchased, acquired, sold, exchanged or mortgaged by the Corporation except with the previous consent of the Governor in Council . . ."

I have no quarrel with that.

> ". . . and if the Corporation is unable to agree with the owner of any real property or private station that it is so authorized to purchase, as to the price to be paid therefor, the Corporation has the right to acquire . . ."

-- and this is the part I object to --

> ". . . the Corporation has the right to acquire the same without the consent of the owner . . ."

MR. COYNE: And the provisions of the

Expropriation Act, you understand, are applicable to the acquisition of such property by the Corporation?

MR. TAYLOR: That is right.

MR. COYNE: It is simply applying the normal provisions of the Expropriation Act in this field.

MR. TAYLOR: Yes, in the radio field, but I want to go one step further: that part is possibly bad enough, where people in the country may invest their money in a radio station and then for reasons of its own the Corporation may acquire that and arbitrate the amount of compensation to be paid.

MR. COYNE: But isn't the licencee when he receives his licence aware that these are the regulations under which he operates?

MR. TAYLOR: Yes; I think it is another place where free enterprise is held in contempt. Why should men who invest their money have to kow-tow to government? Why should they have to bow to the control of a board?

MR. COYNE: You say there should be no control of any kind?

MR. TAYLOR: I believe there should be control over the air-lines, but I believe there should be no control other than is evident in the field of broadcasting.

MR. COYNE: Do you agree that there should be in this country a national broadcasting service for the purpose of making national programmes available to the people of this country?

MR. TAYLOR: If that is done I think it

should be done in competition with other stations.

MR. COYNE: In other words, you feel that the CBC should only be entitled to programme its own programmes through its own stations?

MR. TAYLOR: I think there are two approaches. If you want to take the cold totalitarian view that radio must be controlled by the State, then all radio is controlled by the State; they control all thought and everything that goes over the radio. Here you have a model where you have the national programme given all the authority, and then individuals who invest their money are given rights under certain conditions to get a licence.

MR. COYNE: Why do you call it totalitarian?

MR. TAYLOR: Because that is what it is. It is a definite attempt, when you start to control all thought in radio, it is the first thing a totalitarian or fascist or communist state wants to do.

MR. COYNE: You are concerned lest there be some danger that the CBC, as a Crown corporation, would seek to impose its own views or government views upon the people?

MR. TAYLOR: I am not concerned they would do that; I am concerned they are doing that. They are today attempting to control that, and I think I have given ample demonstration of that in the regulations I have outlined.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before you leave this point on this contempt for free enterprise, I don't know

too much about the laws of Alberta, but somewhere, it strikes me, that the Government of Alberta has, either itself or through a board, given authority to operate oil wells within Alberta and to set out the rules whereby private oil wells may compete; is that correct?

MR. TAYLOR: No; we do not operate oil wells in Alberta.

THE CHAIRMAN: But do you not control the way in which oil wells are operated?

MR. TAYLOR: That is right, and the same rules set up apply to all who come in.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then, you make regulation?

MR. TAYLOR: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: And you are, then, setting up a board with authority to control the operation of oil wells within Alberta?

MR. TAYLOR: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: And you set out the rules whereby private stations may compete?

MR. TAYLOR: Private oil companies.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, oil companies, may compete?

MR. TAYLOR: Yes, in the interests of the development of the province and the people.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you showing contempt for free enterprise?

MR. TAYLOR: I would point out there is a very great difference in the illustration you are using.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are only trying to get at your views.

MR. TAYLOR: I am going to say that we are not in the business; we are not one business operating oil wells. We are not laying down the rules for our own selves and then asking private companies to fall in line. The rules are set up for all, and if the Government wants to go into it they should go in under the same regulations.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, they do, of course, in radio.

MR. TAYLOR: No, sir, they don't. The rules are set up and the private stations are asked to toe the mark. As an illustration, there is nothing better than the fact that there is evidence in Canada today in connection with the CBC and private stations: take the ordinary baseball game; the umpire is supposed to be impartial, and he lays out the rules for both sides and both sides play to those rules. If the umpire starts telling the captain of one team who is going to play, or, worse still, if he starts to play on one side, it makes a pretty unfair sport.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, but suppose all the players are on the same team?

MR. TAYLOR: You could not have a game; you need two teams.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are perfectly right, but if the concept,as taken in the statute, is that the CBC shall carry on a national broadcasting service within Canada then that is a concept of doing a job

by a team.

MR. TAYLOR: And that is exactly a part of the totalitarian aspect that I am objecting to. We want teams, not a team. Everybody should play.

MR. COYNE: If the whole of the broadcasting system were nationalized, and no private stations, would you still call it totalitarian?

MR. TAYLOR: I certainly would.

MR. COYNE: Why would it differ in that respect from the Alberta Telephone System?

MR. TAYLOR: It would differ in that respect because the Alberta Telephone System is a utility. Even there, sir, because the Alberta Government happens to be operating a telephone system in this province -- and it is something that this Government inherited -- does not mean that even if the principle was right in one case that it would be right in the other. I don't think pulling red herrings across to get the spotlight off the CBC is a thing we want to do. In the Alberta Government Telephones we are offering a service to the people. There is no private station shut out.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is no private station allowed, is there?

MR. TAYLOR: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Private telephone system?

MR. TAYLOR: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: So you are competing with a private system?

MR. TAYLOR: No, they don't compete. We

are supplementary to it. The City of Edmonton has its own telephone system. They are granted it without charge, without cost; the only case in evidence in the whole continent where they have no charge whatsoever to hook in for long distance facilities to another telephone system, but it is supplementary to, and it is serving the same people; it is a utility serving all of the people. I don't think it is a utility that can be compared to radio. Radio is not a utility.

MR. COYNE: Well, that was my next question. You don't consider broadcasting is in any sense a utility?

MR. TAYLOR: I don't think it is a public utility.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is it a public service?

MR. TAYLOR: Yes, I think it is a public service.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is the difference between the Edmonton telephone system which you give a service to -- hook-up and tie-up -- and a private radio station to whom the CBC supplies a programme, which they have told us they are very glad to have?

MR. TAYLOR: There is all the difference in the world. In the case of a radio station both are competing for the same listening audience. In the case of a telephone system, one is necessary to the other. The City of Edmonton could not possibly conduct long distance toll lines, and a telephone system which was just local would be very inadequate

and unsatisfactory in this modern day. The two telephone systems are working supplementary to each other, but a CBC station and a private station are competing with each other for the same listening audience, or a greater proportion of that same audience.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: When Mr. Dunton appeared before us in Ottawa he brought out the fact that the CBC were forced by law to provide a national broadcasting service, and in order to do so they would have to have stations all over the place, or they could have their stations supplemented by the private stations, so that as a result of those thoughts there has been a complementary system of public and private stations. He also, in the course of questioning, stated that since he was obliged to carry through a national system, you could not divorce responsibility from authority, and consequently the CBC was required to set up regulations. Would you care to make any observations on that point?

MR. TAYLOR: That is the very thing I am making objection to.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Well, you are objecting to the Act itself rather than the regulations and the manner in which CBC are carrying on?

MR. TAYLOR: That is right. The Act was brought in by the Federal Government.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: I see.

MR. TAYLOR: I may say I have no complaints

whatsoever against Mr. Dunton. He has always been a perfect gentleman as far as I am concerned, and so have all operators of CBC stations. This is "principle" I am dealing with, not individuals.

THE CHAIRMAN: May I ask you, Mr. Taylor, in your contention, should Section 8 of the Broadcasting Act, which requires the Corporation to carry on a national broadcasting service within Canada, this whole concept of a national service tying Canada together east and west, bringing out points of view to people in different parts of the country, doing school broadcasting, providing special service which is non- commercial to farmers, and a general national service, do you think that should not be a function of the Federal Government?

MR. TAYLOR: Well, I would say this, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that if the Federal Government wants to be in the broadcasting field, if it is a free enterprise government and its principles are those of free enterprise, it should go into that field in competition with the private stations -- in complete competition under the same rules without any authority over its competitors. Secondly, I would suggest that that is a matter of government policy and it is far from me to suggest policies.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are suggesting lots of policies.

MR. TAYLOR: I will take that back. As a Canadian citizen, when I see things striking at me I have a right to suggest policies, and I hope

we never lose the right, and it is the danger of losing that right that brings me here today. I would suggest if the Federal Government wants to go into this field, there is a splendid place for it to do so in the programming end. There is no necessity for it to be duplicating our private radio stations with stations such as we have in Alberta. We have ample private radio stations that can fill the bill in Alberta today without CBC. I enjoy a lot of the programmes. The way they are in the field of providing programmes that may or may not be used by private stations is one thing, but to say, "This is it; this is what you have to have; this is the way it is going to be" is entirely a different policy.

(Page 1940 follows)

THE CHAIRMAN: That was not my question, I was asking you whether is a matter of federal government policy on which you are making comment you feel that the federal government should directly or indirectly through a Board carry on a national broadcasting service within Canada, which it now is doing under Section 8 of the Broadcasting Act. Do you want a national broadcasting service in Canada, do you think it is a desirable thing or do you think it is undesirable?

MR. TAYLOR: I would suggest that if the national government wants to be in the field at all, in the broadcasting field, it should be in competition with other stations, there should not be the monetary requirements in the Act that it must operate such a service. Secondly, that it could serve the people of Canada, in my opinion, and at much less cost than it is doing today by providing programmes that would be available to private stations.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us follow that down a moment. First of all, would it have any power on an important national issue programme to require the private stations to carry it?

MR. TAYLOR: I do not think it should.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would it supply these programmes free or would it charge money for them?

MR. TAYLOR: I think it should charge money, private stations have never asked for a free ride.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, now let us take farm broadcasts, why would a private station ever carry

a farm broadcast if it could sell the time to an advertiser?

MR. TAYLOR: Because the private station is just as anxious to provide public service to the people, maybe more anxious than the station controlled by the government -- just as anxious, at least.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have your point, you think if there is a programme service it should be non-compulsory and it should be sold?

MR. TAYLOR: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I assume at cost or to recover the cost?

MR. TAYLOR: It should be sold unless it is a case where it may be in the public interest to supply it free, if that is so, such as farm broadcasts or information on health; I have no objection to that, but I have objection to the present way that the Canadian Corporation has a monopoly on all national advertising, and then the people of Canada are asked to pay part of the bill for the national advertising, so again we have condemned free enterprise at the expense of the people of this country.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Taylor, turning to your second point, regulation No. 14, at the bottom of page 2 you say:

> "We deem this regulation as unwarranted and unnecessary interference."

I was just wondering, interference with what? In other words, from your earlier remarks you say it

is unwarranted and unnecessary interference?

MR. TAYLOR: Interference with the way of a private radio station that wants to conduct its own business.

MR. COYNE: Do you feel that the private radio stations which enjoy the very special right of using one of the limited number of air channels should be required to devote its activities to the public interest as distinct from its own private interests? Is there anything different about a private radio station because of the fact that it in effect has a franchise and if one person owns it another person cannot get it when it is already occupied?

MR. TAYLOR: There may be some grounds for what you are suggesting if there was only a limited number and you had to ration the air channels, but there is no limited number of air channels.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Taylor, of course the principal part of our inquiry is television and in television there is a very limited number of channels.

MR. TAYLOR: There may be a limited number today but twenty-five years ago there was also a very limited number of channels for ordinary radio, twenty-five years ago if you carried two conversations on one channel, a one-voice channel on a telephone wire it was something wonderful but to-day you can do six hundred.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is true, but we have to write our report this year.

MR. TAYLOR: I would suggest that the

findings of science today certainly should be taken very carefully in writing the report and there is certainly further indication that there is going to be ample air channels for television.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Coyne's question was that today there is a limited number of television channels and he is asking you if there is anything in your view special about a branch that has a limited franchise presently available.

MR.TAYLOR: I would like to make two or three comments on that; number one, not nearly the number of limited channels have yet been used, there is still a considerable number of unused television channels in Canada. Secondly, the CBC you say gives these to the private television station as a right.

MR. COYNE: Well, yes, the government licenses, they grant licences.

MR. TAYLOR: I would suggest if it is given to the company to carry on that then they should be able to carry on their business as a free enterprise business, not hamstrung by regulations -- without any regulations.

THE CHAIRMAN: Without any regulations?

MR. TAYLOR: I would say that the channel itself, you must keep order in the air channels, you have necessary regulation there in a very highly technical field, but certainly not any more regulation of publication of it than in newspapers today.

MR. COYNE: Of course, in a metropolitan centre like Edmonton there are now a number of radio

stations and I suppose there will eventually be a number of television stations, but there are many areas in this country, smaller areas, where, and it is represented to us as a practical matter, there is never going to be more than one television station; for instance, Grande Prairie, the more isolated and more sparsely settled places in the country. Now, do the same considerations, you feel, apply to an area of that kind where there is only one privately owned television station, there is no competition, would there still be no regulation or control in the public interest?

MR. TAYLOR: I would say, sir, that the free enterprise system has been found to be unequalled in the history of the world. I know of a number of hamlets in this province where there is only one grocery store and some where there is only one garage, but they still have competition, the fact that there is only one, from an economic point of view, whether it belongs to the corporation or private enterprise does not change that fact.

MR. COYNE: Except perhaps from this point of view, that the private enterprise station, by its nature, has to make a profit; the public enterprise station, by its nature, does not make a profit.

MR. TAYLOR: I would suggest from the recent reports of Mr. Dunton to Parliament that the Commission certainly does not make a profit, but the people of Canada are paying out, and a lot of people who have no hope of getting television are paying

that deficit today of $20 million. Private enterprise would be forced to make a profit, and, secondly, a private enterprise station in Grande Prairie would have to cater to the people, they are responsible to the people, otherwise they just won't stay in business very long. The Corporation is responsible to somebody two thousand miles away and I think the whole story is more private enterprise and less socialism.

MR. COYNE: I take from your answer you would apply this principle universally across the board, in any station there should be no control or regulation of private stations subject to the air waves, the technical matters?

MR. TAYLOR: Yes, that is right. There is one newspaper in Grande Prairie but we do not tell them how much they put in or send out.

MR. COYNE: Of course, they can receive the Edmonton papers but not the television.

MR. TAYLOR: That may be, however, I do not know in time I think they probably would. I would like to say that I think private enterprise can do anything a government can do and do it better because it is competitive in nature, it is responsible to the people, it pays its way or goes bankrupt, it is not being supplemented by money out of the government coffers.

MR. COYNE: You say it can do the same thing on the programming aspect of television, it has been represented to us and is subject to check, that no national advertiser in Canada, because of

the limited market in Canada, is prepared to pay the full cost of network programme shows in Canada of Canadian origin. Now, does it not follow that if there was no government subsidized network, there might be some private network, but surely the programmes would have to be brought down to a level where they would pay their way, and that would make, do you not agree, a very great difference in the programming that such a network would carry?

MR. TAYLOR: I would suggest it might improve the programme tremendously.

THE CHAIRMAN: Or it might mean they would all be imported; would that bother you?

MR. TAYLOR: It would not bother me if that is what the people wanted.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is not the question.

MR. TAYLOR: If people were dissatisfied private enterprise would soon know and they would have to cut their cloth to meet the demands of the people. We are certainly importing a lot of American programmes today under our present set-up.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: How would the people make their views felt to the private network or the private stations if they did not like a programme?

MR. TAYLOR: Some newspapers editorialize their news. Now, they can do that if they like, it is not good publication but they can do that, but the views of the people soon reach their editor because people generally object to that kind of thing in this country.

THE CHAIRMAN: But if the views of the people are there and do not happen to commend themselves to the publisher or editor of the newspaper they can do right on doing what they have been doing?

MR. TAYLOR: It may be done in even a more effective way, they might stop buying the products that the station depends on, and when you start attacking the pocketbook you get pretty close to reality.

MR. COYNE: Would it be going too far to say that what you recommend is a system of radio and television in this country, a privately operated commercial system similar to that which now exists in the United States where it is financed by private enterprise, the listener determines the content through its various ratings and that sort of thing and there is no attempt by any government agency to develop national sustaining programmes?

MR. TAYLOR: Exactly.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is your view?

MR. TAYLOR: That is right. I would say, as I have said before, I have no objection to the Parliament of Canada voting moneys for the corporation of national programmes that would be available to private stations if they wanted to use them.

MR. COYNE: But only if they wanted to use them?

MR. TAYLOR: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: You do not feel that in radio and television there is any importance to be attached

to the representations we have had that this is a very powerful medium of tying this country together east and west?

MR. TAYLOR: Because it is so powerful, sir, I am most anxious that that is not controlled, and I am convinced that the private stations are just as anxious for Canada to be a nation of ten provinces and not ten separate states as any government in Canada.

THE CHAIRMAN: That may be controlled by private stations, too, might it not?

MR. TAYLOR: Only to a very limited extent, and if that is controlled by a private station ---

THE CHAIRMAN: It is controlled by private newspapers.

MR. TAYLOR: That is right, but they do not have a monopoly on it and they are in competition with others in the area, and a station that carries only very slanted news or a very twisted version of the news is not going to be staying in business.

MR. COYNE: What happens in Edmonton where you only have a single daily paper?

MR. TAYLOR: Are you asking me?

MR. COYNE: Yes, is there any danger by a monopoly situation where you only have one outlet in the publishing field, is there any danger of this sort of thought control that you have been speaking of?

MR. TAYLOR: No. 1, if the paper was controlled by any government I would think it would be

very, very dangerous. No. 2, I think it would be far better if the Edmonton paper, and I think it is a good paper, but I think it would be far better if the paper had competition in Edmonton with at least one other daily paper.

MR. COYNE: But I gather that economics is one reason why there is not another?

MR. TAYLOR: Well, frankly, there may be other considerations, I do not know, but I am sure that the people of this part of the country could support two newspapers.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is wrong with the good old free enterprise getting started?

MR. TAYLOR: Give them a chance. It is one of the few places in Canada where free enterprise has not provided another.

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, there are quite a number.

MR. TAYLOR: Only one daily? Well, possibly so, but I think if the economics dictated, if the company cannot stay in business, well, that is it, that is free enterprise.

MR. COYNE: Turning to your third section on regulation, 5-G, and particularly on page 5 where you are speaking of this requirement for the consent of the Corporation, do you have any specific example in connection with local or provincial catastrophies that you speak of where the consent of the Corporation was ever unreasonably refused, or where the necessity of obtaining consent seriously held up the appeal for a flood or a fire?

MR. TAYLOR: No.

MR. COYNE: I mean, we have been in Winnipeg and Vancouver where they have had serious floods and other catastrophies, and this is the first time this point has been brought to our attention.

MR. TAYLOR: It is the principle, not the regulation, I am objecting to, I think the men in the CBC offices are just as human as those in other offices and just as anxious to help in an emergency, but why should a private station have to go and seek the written permission before having an appeal for funds? I cannot follow that, I see no need for it, and I think it is unwarranted interference.

MR. COYNE: But really your point is on the principle?

MR. TAYLOR: That is right.

MR. COYNE: You are not concerned with whether it has or has not operated in a detrimental fashion?

MR. TAYLOR: That is right.

MR. COYNE: Your second point in connection with this regulation, you are speaking of religious convictions, and you say:

> "It is evangelical/in nature and carries with/it a universal appeal recognizing the final right of each and every individual to work for and support and believe in the church and doctrine of his choice."

Surely you would not suggest that this regulation which limits or restricts appeals for financial

support that that interferes with our freedom to worship as our heart and mind dictates?

MR. TAYLOR: I am not suggesting, I am stating in fact emphatically that in my opinion it does interfere with it.

MR. COYNE: There is no discrimination, is there, as between different bodies that wish to broadcast?

MR. TAYLOR: Well, that is rather a subtle way of doing it, they tell the people they can go on the radio and say anything they like about doctrines, have their service, any religious service they want, but when it comes to them asking for funds to keep them on the air they cannot do it. Now, how can a group stay on the air without support? It is just impossible. They can do it on the one hand and on the other the conditions make it impossible for it to be done.

MR. COYNE: But certainly the churches are remaining on the air and time is made available to them through the CBC and the private stations without discrimination?

MR. TAYLOR: Oh, I am not charging discrimination, I am charging the regulation is on the books that enables any church to be cut off the air at any time if they ask for funds.

MR. COYNE: Oh, if they ask for funds?

MR. TAYLOR: But how can you stay on the air if you do not ask for funds?

THE CHAIRMAN: Do they not stay on the air

quite well under these regulations?

MR. TAYLOR: Some do and some do not.

THE CHAIRMAN: Some have, anyway.

MR. TAYLOR: But any church that wants to preach the gospel or any church that has religious views surely should have the right to ask for funds over the air, and if other people want to support them why should the CBC interfere? Why should they say that I cannot ask for support for the particular church I work for outside of the radio station from which I am speaking?

THE CHAIRMAN: We cannot answer that question, but we are going to find out.

MR. TAYLOR: I hope you will. I think that is a most fundamental point in this whole thing.

THE CHAIRMAN: The main point is, it is not the freedom to worship that you are talking about but the freedom to contribute money to the religious organization that is broadcasting that you are objecting to?

MR. TAYLOR: Well, I tie that in with freedom to worship because in this country there are people of all denominations who want to hear their own church on the air, and if there can be no appeal for funds they cannot stay on the air.

MR. COYNE: Of course, they can appeal through their local station?

MR. TAYLOR: But why try to localize Christian people? I just cannot follow the thinking in this.

MR. COYNE: Turning to page 7, where you are still dealing with this regulation, you say:

> "This regulation threatens something else that is fundamental too and that is the right of every Canadian to support any cause which he deems worthy of financial assistance. The Corporation through this regulation is endeavouring to tell Canadians how they may or may not spend their own money."

Now, surely this regulation does not interfere with the right of Canadians to support any cause which they deem worthy of financial assistance?

MR. TAYLOR: Again I say it does and I say again it is a lefthanded way of doing it.

MR. COYNE: Further on you say:

> "Canadians are quite capable of deciding what causes to support with money or goods and should not be denied the opportunity of deciding themselves on the merits of any cause."

Do you consider this a restriction which restricts Canadians the opportunity to decide on the merits of a cause?

MR. TAYLOR: Yes, if we deny them the right to hear all sides, yes.

MR. COYNE: But we do not deny them the right to hear all sides.

MR. TAYLOR: We deny them the right when we

say they cannot ask for support; how can they stay on the air if they do not get support?

THE CHAIRMAN: But many do?

MR. TAYLOR: Many do not, but whether they are staying on or not, it is a principle involved, where any government board can control that in this nation, I think we should do away with the last inkling of any such trend.

MR. COYNE: And your point is, Mr. Taylor, that all stations should be completely free to solicit funds on behalf of any, well, I think here you are limiting yourself to churches and religious bodies, or would you go further and say they should be free to solicit for funds for anything in the judgment of the station manager?

MR. TAYLOR: Sure, they should operate their business in a way that is compatible with their own thinking.

MR. COYNE: Now, just turning to page 8, where you are dealing with the question of political parties and you say:

> ". . . the people have a right to know and to hear all points of view and all philosophies and to contribute to the one or ones of their choice."

Now, what do I understand you to mean, that this regulation which deals with and restricts appeals for funds, in your view, that interferes with the people hearing all points of view?

MR. TAYLOR: Yes, sir.

MR. COYNE: Although, you would agree, would you not, that there is in fact no discrimination at the moment between different points of view and the availability of air time to proponents of different kinds?

MR. TAYLOR: I say again it is a left-handed way of doing it; they say they can do it and then deny them the opportunity of doing it through funds. I can see no reason why the Corporation should interest itself in whether or not I contribute to this cause or that cause or whether or not people ask support for any cause.

MR. COYNE: What about the regulation which says that each station shall allocate time for political programmes as fairly as possible among all parties; do you think that is a good regulation?

MR. TAYLOR: Well, I would suggest, sir, that the actual distribution of time for private radio stations is not necessary.

MR. COYNE: Would there not be some danger if there was not some provision for the allotment of equivalent time that those points of view and philosophies that had the largest sums of money behind them would be able to buy up the time on radio stations and thereby the points of view which were not in a position financially to make their way?

MR. TAYLOR: That is exactly the way it is today. The major political parties who have large sums of money are able to go on the air as

they wish; parties just beginning who have not yet a large national following are denied the right to ask for funds even from those who believe their cause is right.

MR. COYNE: But surely the established parties in political broadcasting receive some benefit from that regulation with respect to the allocation of time fairly between the different parties?

MR. TAYLOR: Oh,I would think so. I think under a totally private enterprise system that there would certainly be no danger of any group being denied the right to the air because it would be paying its way, and that is the way the station is in business.

MR. COYNE: Provided they were in a position to pay their way?

MR. TAYLOR: Well, they would certainly be in a far better position than they are today when they are denied the right to ask for subscriptions or funds or donations.

MR. COYNE: Those are all the questions I have, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: I just have one other question. I want to be sure I have your meaning, and on page 2 there is one paragraph and it is the third paragraph on the page, and I do not get your meaning:

> "If it is wrong for the elected government of a province to merely operate a radio station, is it right for the federal government to operate

its own stations and at the same time regulate and control private stations?"

You know that radio is a matter which constitutionally falls within the federal sphere, and I do not quite see what wrong and right have to do with it. Let me give you another illustration. I will put another set of words; another federal power is the business of defence, it is wrong for the elected government of a province to operate an army. Is it right for the federal government to operate its own army and at the same time regulate and control private armies? Surely it is part of the exercise of the constitutional power, is it not?

(Page 1958 follows)

MR. TAYLOR: Again, I would like to deal with the comparison: if the Federal Government, in defence, stated that the Federal Government would set up an army and they would hear applications by any private group to set up an army, it would be entirely comparable, but in this case the Act simply states that radio is Federal, and then it gives an opportunity for others to apply under similar conditions to operate. What I am suggesting is that since it has taken that privilege itself of operating radio, then surely if the Saskatchewan Government or the Manitoba Government or the Quebec Government feel they can serve their people in classical music or some other field of radio, it should not be denied the privilege.

THE CHAIRMAN: But suppose you felt you could serve your people by starting an army?

MR. TAYLOR: There is no comparable legislation; there is no legislation which says private people can set up armies of their own.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Is there something in the Act which prohibits a licence being given to a provincial government?

MR. TAYLOR: No, there is nothing in the Act, but the Government has made it abundantly clear that they are not -- or the Minister of Transport to issue licences.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: You have referred several times to the right of private stations to compete. Have you any opinion on the ownership of air channels? Who owns the air channels in the

country? Is that public domain or is it private?

MR. TAYLOR: I don't think you can designate them as being owned by anyone. They are something that is provided like sunshine and air.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: But there is a limited number, and do you not agree the Government has a right to grant franchise and the right to control that franchise?

MR. TAYLOR: I was suggesting in my first statement that the Government certainly has the responsibility to control the air-ways and keep order in the air-ways the same as they have the responsibility of keeping order in other fields. That is exactly what I think it should do but should stay out of broadcasting.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: And would have no right to control the kind of service the people are getting -- educational or forums and so on?

MR. TAYLOR: No, I don't think there is any need of a government to control that. Our people are not illiterate. We are not irresponsible children where there has to be a father standing over it with a strap. You are dealing with probably the most enlightened people in the world when you are dealing with Canadians. We don't need a government to tell us what we should listen to. We can do that ourselves.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Taylor. We will consider your brief.

---A short recess.

SUBMISSION OF ALBERTA FEDERATION OF HOME AND SCHOOL ASSOCIATIONS

Appearances:

Mrs. B. P. Marliss

Mr. W. E. Hodgson

- - - - -

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief we had on our agenda this morning was from the University of Alberta, but I understand Mrs. Marliss who is appearing for the Alberta Federation of Home and School Associations is anxious to present her brief first and also that the University representatives are not objecting to the change in the order.

Mrs. Marliss, you have Mr. W. E. Hodgson with you?

MRS. MARLISS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will begin by marking your brief as Exhibit 81.

EXHIBIT NO. 81: Brief of Alberta Association of Home and School Associations.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you present it, please?

MRS. MARLISS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Hodgson is president of the Alberta Federation, and I am speaking for the Federation because I am the chairman of the Audio Visual Committee. I don't intend to read my brief, but I would like to point out some of the highlights. We represent 30,000 members with 570 local organizations. There will have to be a correction made on the brief; it should have been 570 instead of 530.

Our national organization will be presenting a brief when you get back east, so we are restricting our submission to an Alberta problem.

I think it would be well to point out two of the main objects of our Association: one, to promote the welfare of children and youth; and two, to confer and co-operate with organizations other than schools which concern themselves with the care, protection and training of children and youth in the home, school and community, and with the education of adults to meet these responsibilities. I think perhaps this point is one which we are most concerned with.

The members of our organization are interested and concerned about the scope of school broadcasts. They were begun in 1939. That, also, will have to be corrected on the brief. It should read 1939 instead of 1929.

THE CHAIRMAN: You mean at the bottom of page one?

MRS. MARLISS: Yes. They are receiving very wide acceptance by the teachers in the province. We feel that there is no question any more about the value of school broadcasts; they have been accepted across Canada. However, we now have a problem of getting sufficient coverage for these school broadcasts. In the Province of Alberta we have 3,500 outlets. However, there is a very large area that does not receive signals from the stations that are carrying school broadcasts. CBX was designed

to provide this coverage in the whole province, but there are areas that do not receive CBX signal. Some areas get a weak or spasmodic signal. In order to complement CBX it was necessary to set up an educational network that was not considered part of the basic Trans-Canada network. For some time now we have had CHAT, Medicine Hat, CJOC, Lethbridge, and, in the north, CFGP, Grande Prairie, and, of course, CKUA, the Alberta Government non-commercial station carries all the educational broadcasts.

The greatest coverage problem hasbeen in the Calgary area, and here we have really had a problem. The north and south hills in Calgary have had good reception from CBX, but in the Bow River Valley and some of the industrial areas they get very poor reception. In order to supplement this we have had assistance from some of the local Calgary stations for brief periods in 1951, 1953, 1954 and 1955. Right now in the spring of 1956 we have had no coverage over CBX. That means that those schools that would like to use school broadcasts cannot use them. Some of them have equipment, and the teachers are anxious to use them and yet they are denied the use of school broadcasts.

The Calgary position is not the only one. The big problem, of course, since the advent of television is that the national sponsors have been channelling their main appropriations into television, and small amounts have gone into radio, and

this means they are mainly for daytime use. We are not quarrelling with the private stations who want to get all the revenue they can. After all, that is their business and we feel they have the right to sell their time whenever they can, and, if it interferes with the school broadcasts, they have asked that we review their commitments for next year. So, we are not sure whether we will get any assistance from private stations. There may be some, but it is doubtful whether we will get any.

This leaves the present educational network in a very precarious position because we are now dependent on CBX and CKUA. Also, those areas that are out of the CBC orbit are not only not getting school broadcasts, but they are also denied a great many of the other programmes which we, as parents, feel they should be getting; for instance, Kindergarten of the Air, and the mental health programmes are not carried by the commercial stations.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are those CBC programmes?

MRS. MARLISS: Yes. We feel since all the taxpayers in the Province of Alberta pay the same excise tax on their radio equipment that they should be entitled to equal service from the CBC. It has been demonstrated that we cannot get all the educational programmes through the private stations that we would like to get, and so we feel that we would like to get CBC to extend its service to all areas of Alberta to give them equal coverage.

THE CHAIRMAN: We may have a few questions for you. Have you anything to add, Mr. Hodgson?

MR. HODGSON: I have not, sir, thank you.

MR. COYNE: Mrs. Marliss, at the top of page 2 you refer to the important link between parents and the school by giving parents a greater knowledge of both subject matter and methods of teaching. Do the parents listen to these broadcasts?

MRS. MARLISS: As a matter of fact, they do. In the Home and School we have quite an educational programme along those lines of encouraging parents. As a matter of fact, we have just finished a television experiment where the children at the school watch television programmes and the parents were given questionnaires and outlines of the programmes and asked to give their comments on it, and we suggested that parents discuss these programmes with their children, and we have found it is a very, very good thing between the home and the school.

MR. COYNE: You feel it is worth while and you are, in fact, encouraging the parents to listen to these broadcasts and take part?

MRS. MARLISS: Very definitely. The CBC has co-operated with us. The Young Canada Listens booklet is made available to Home and School, and we distribute them to our members so they know when the broadcasts are, and we get letters saying they cannot watch them because they cannot get CBC in their area. These parents are frustrated; they feel their children are not getting what other

children are getting.

MR. COYNE: How many hours a week are the school broadcasts put on in Alberta?

MRS. MARLISS: Monday through Friday, eleven to eleven-fifteen in the morning, and then two to two-thirty in the afternoon.

MR. COYNE: That is 45 minutes a day, five days a week?

MRS. MARLISS: Yes.

MR. COYNE: On page 2 where you refer to these four stations, I think you may have dealt with this in your opening statement, but are those the only four private stations which carry these broadcasts?

MRS. MARLISS: No, there were some Calgary stations.

MR. COYNE: I meant at the present time -- CHAT, CJOC, CFGP and CKUA?

MRS. MARLISS: I think so right now, yes.

MR. COYNE: Do you know what the reason is that no private station in Calgary carries these broadcasts?

MRS. MARLISS: I think there is no question about the reason; it is a question of revenue. They are not paid to carry them. The Department of Education does not pay for the use of time on private stations, and if they can get revenue during that time -- and their revenues have decreased at night because of television competition -- well, that is the reason.

MR. COYNE: So, as far as you know, the reason is a purely commercial one, and they want to sell the time?

MRS. MARLISS: That is right.

MR. COYNE: Dealing with the question you raise on page 3 where you are concerned about this development in respect of coverage in the future, have any stations as yet dropped broadcasts for this reason -- you have referred to the Calgary area where you have never had continuous coverage?

MRS. MARLISS: That is something I am not competent to tell you about because I do not make the contracts. We only get the information after the arrangements have been made. We have been given to understand that the stations have asked that their plans be reviewed before any commitments be made next fall.

MR. COYNE: So your concern is particularly for the future, looking to next year?

MRS. MARLISS: That is right, next fall, because the arrangements were all made for this term.

MR. COYNE: Does your organization feel that private stations should be required to carry school broadcasts as a public service?

MRS. MARLISS: Well, I don't think I can speak for the organization in this particular case. This principle was accepted by our convention, but that question was not brought up, and I would hesitate to speak for the organization.

MR. COYNE: That is quite all right. Your

organization is not putting forward any view on that subject?

MRS. MARLISS: No.

MR. HODGSON: We should express the concern that these broadcasts be made available. That is the concern Mrs. Marliss has expressed already, and if it requires private stations, we would be in favour of it.

MR. COYNE: That leads to my next question, where you urge that the CBC consider some means of increasing the coverage: have you any specific recommendations as to how the coverage could be increased? I suppose one way would be to require private stations to carry the broadcasts.

MRS. MARLISS: Well, not being engineers, I don't feel competent to make the suggestion. However, some people more competent have suggested that booster stations may be erected in Calgary and in the north areas, or there may be an increase in the strength of the home transmitter, or a whole series of booster stations. Those suggestions were made, but as a member of Home and School I would hesitate to suggest the remedy. All I can say is that we feel there should be a remedy and it would be up to the CBC to find the best solution.

MR. COYNE: But I take it from what Mr. Hodgson said that you would not exclude as one possibility the requirement that the private stations be required to carry these broadcasts?

MRS. MARLISS: Well, I hadn't given it any thought.

MR. COYNE: All right, I won't press that. You did say your Association did not take a position on it?

MRS. MARLISS: No, we haven't committed ourselves on the method that may be used.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you are satisfied with the importance and worth of these school broadcasts as you have seen them in operation?

MRS. MARLISS: We definitely feel they are most important, that they are an important part of our educational system, and we feel all people in the province should have the advantage of seeing them.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Do you think the rural areas get more benefit from them than the urban areas, thinking particularly of your difficulty in Calgary?

MRS. MARLISS: I think perhaps the rural areas use the broadcasts in proportion -- I am not sure, but we feel we get more response from some rural areas. I don't know whether the whole reason would be that we may have more highly trained teachers in the urban areas; I am not sure whether that may be one of the reasons, but I can see where in some areas the school broadcasts would perhaps help the teachers there.

MR. COYNE: You also make the point that apart from the school broadcasts programmes the Trans-Canada network generally does not adequately cover the province of Alberta?

MRS. MARLISS: Well, any area that does not get school broadcasts will not get any of the

other Trans-Canada broadcasts.

MR. COYNE: But the two networks are not exactly the same, are they?

MRS. MARLISS: Well, they are not exactly the same. The coverage would be the same.

MR. COYNE: In any event, I am right in taking from this paragraph on page 3 that you feel that coverage of the Trans-Canada network generally is not adequate in terms of covering the whole province?

MRS. MARLISS: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: This is a somewhat technical question and it may be outside your knowledge as it is largely outside mine, but do you know anything about the quality of the receiving sets in these areas where there is difficulty of reception? Is it by any chance the inadequacy of the receiving set rather than the inadequacy of the signal that is causing the trouble?

MRS. MARLISS: It has been pointed out to us that a high quality and expensive set with an elaborate aerial would probably get that signal. There is no use denying that. The only thing is that most of the schools would be reluctant to provide that type of equipment, and the overall cost of supplying that type of equipment for the whole province would far exceed the cost of booster stations.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Who pays for the various sets?

MRS. MARLISS: As a matter of fact, that

is paid mostly on a co-operative basis by the Department of Edcuation, the local school board and the parents in the area; it is a three-way thing.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Where do these school broadcasts originate? Are they a product of the Department of Education of Alberta?

MRS. MARLISS: That is right. There are some that are produced nationally by the national school broadcasts; they come on on Fridays. They are national school broadcasts carried on the whole network.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Do you know whether the private networks have been approached to carry them? You say they don't because of the revenue question, but have they been approached to carry them for fifteen minutes in the morning and half an hour in the afternoon?

MRS. MARLISS: I can't answer that. They haven't, to my knowledge.

THE CHAIRMAN: You did say your organization did not have the funds?

MRS. MARLISS: Very definitely not; our organization is not a fund-raising organization.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: You like the programmes but you can't afford to pay for them?

MRS. MARLISS: That is right. The programmes are there; that is the part that annoys us. The cost of the programmes is paid. They are produced but they are not getting the coverage. It would not cost any more to give that programme to

fifty thousand people than it does to ten thousand people because the production costs are the same. So, we are wasting that opportunity to give that additional education to a large section of the province.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think you mentioned several points as to why you think these programmes are valuable; they may or may not be covered in your brief, but do you think they have a value in joining different parts of Canada together and broadening the knowledge of children and their parents?

MRS. MARLISS: Very definitely; I don't think there would be any question in my mind about that. Anyone who listens to the Friday afternoon Social Study broadcasts -- well, whether my children saw them or not I would not miss them because I feel they are important and I have learned a great deal from them, and I think most Home and School people feel the same way.

THE CHAIRMAN: We thank you for your brief and we will give it consideration.

MRS. MARLISS: Thank you very much for allowing me to come on earlier.

(Page 1972 follows)

SUBMISSION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

THE CHAIRMAN: We will mark your brief as Exhibit 82.

EXHIBIT NO. 82: Brief of University of Alberta.

THE CHAIRMAN: Miss MacKenzie, will you present your brief?

MISS MacKENZIE: Yes, I can read it in fifteen minutes and summarize it in three, and I think I will summarize it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Whichever you like. We have read the brief, so from that point of view it is not necessary to go into all the detail, but by all means touch any of the points which you regard as being important.

MISS MacKENZIE: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen. The University of Alberta is presenting this brief to you this morning because of a strong conviction that the broadcast of educational programmes is of tremendous importance in Canada. Our conviction is based on experience unique in Canada, I believe, that of twenty-nine continuous years in the field of educational broadcasting. Ever since 1927 the University of Alberta has held a licence for broadcasting educational programmes. Our brief is not long and its thesis is not likely to be at all controversial, but the officers of the University have considered that it is important enough to merit your consideration.

The brief outlines all the history of the University's experience with radio and the types of programmes in which the University pioneered, and we feel there has continued to be a need throughout the years. We do mention in the brief the appraisal by a committee of the University Faculty in 1952 of our own work. In 1954 we sent out a questionnaire to about one thousand of our listeners receiving the University's radio programme schedules, and the results encouraged us to continue with the educational broadcasting. Today, because of the competition of the many radio and television stations our radio voice is no doubt all but drowned out at times, but we feel it is important to observe that this is in no way an indication that the need for this type of programme is past. The need is just as great as it ever was and it is not likely to decrease.

Now, perhaps since radio and television have become big business the programmes of an educational nature should in the main be only on a proper scale and by a larger and more powerful organization. In any case, Mr. Chairman, whatever should be the future, the University of Alberta urges that careful cognizance be taken of the tremendous importance of the use of this media in helping to bring educational programmes to Canadians in every section of our country.

I have pleasure in presenting this brief on behalf of the University.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you wish to say anything,

Dr. Johns?

DR. JOHNS: No, I have nothing to add, but I shall be glad to answer any questions.

MR. COYNE: Turning to the bottom of page 3 of your brief you point out:

> "In 1945 the control of CKUA was taken over by the provincial government and the station was placed under the direction of the Alberta Government Telephones."

Can you tell us the reason for this change in set-up of the organization?

MISS MacKENZIE: Well, that is really a matter of government policy, it is a provincial university, the university continued to have all the time it wished but the decision was a government decision.

MR. COYNE: Now, this change, that type of operation, did it have any effect on the type of university programming, what was your educational broadcasting -- were the broadcasts changed or were they fewer? You point out at the top of page 4 that it continued although on a reduced scale to broadcast programmes?

MISS MacKENZIE: Yes, in the early years of radio and the operation of CKUA the University broadcast in the 1930's and 1940's a considerable number of hours per week, but again, as the number of stations to a channel increased and the costs of radio went up, I think the University felt that

with the same budget it was happier in presenting a fewer number of programmes and it at all times was able to present and has been able to present as many as it wished.

MR. COYNE: So that costs were a factor in reducing the number of programmes?

MISS MacKENZIE: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Are programmes still carried in Red Deer, Calgary, Lethbridge or other centres?

MISS MacKENZIE: Not on the same basis which they once were, not on the network, they used to be a Foothills network which carried the programmes. Instead, a number of university programmes are now recorded and sent to other stations for re-broadcast, programmes of special series which the University is pleased to give a wider coverage and which certain other stations are pleased to rebroadcast.

MR. COYNE: Are these programmes offered free to the various stations?

MISS MacKENZIE: Oh, yes, indeed.

MR. COYNE: And could you give us some indication as to how extensively they are carried on the stations generally through the province?

MISS MacKENZIE: They are not carried very extensively, in fact, the series that we distribute in this way is somewhat limited. The Red Deer station, through the Home and School Association, was interested in carrying a varied number of our programmes, perhaps twenty or thirty a year, over that station. We send programmes every spring to

stations in Grande Prairie, Calgary, Lethbridge and Medicine Hat of special interest to graduating high school students and their parents, and, of course, those refer specifically to plans for university. A few years ago we sent some of our programmes to the armed forces stations in the north and we would asked if we would contribute some of them,which we did, but perhaps they were a little too high brow because they were discontinued.

MR. COYNE: I notice on page 4 you say:

> "For the past ten years the University has broadcast approximately ten hours a week during the winter months and five or six hours a week during the summer."

I think you said at one time you broadcast forty hours or even as high as sixty-three hours?

MISS MacKENZIE: That was when the University operated station CKUA and was on the air at different periods through the day, probably eleven to five in the evening hours on a different basis; now we are on the air only in the early evening hours.

MR. COYNE: Of course, at that time there were relatively few stations in this area?

MISS MacKENZIE: Yes.

MR. COYNE: You refer in the next paragraph to listener interest being difficult to gauge in regard to all but the music programmes. Have you made any studies or do you have any actual figures as to the amount of listener interest or have you

made any study of that aspect of it?

MISS MacKENZIE: The only specific study which we made is referred to elsewhere in the brief, the questionnaire sent out a couple of years ago, it is on page 5, I believe, and it was sent to one thousand persons who were receiving our programme schedules. Now, these were persons who had themselves volunteered an interest in our broadcasts and had written and asked to be placed on our mailing list. We sent a questionnaire to these and received replies from 450 of them, which is considered, I understand, a good return for a questionnaire, and almost all of those placed music -- we asked which programme they preferred,which they listened to most frequently, and so on, and these were interpreted differently, but we did find from that that the music programmes rated very, very high, but all our other programmes did have an audience of frequent or occasional listeners.

MR. COYNE: Of course, these were people circulated who were interested in it?

MISS MacKENZIE: Yes.

MR. COYNE: That is no indication as to the total number of people who may be listening to your programme?

MISS MacKENZIE: No.

MR. COYNE: At the bottom of page 6 you say:

> "To compete successfully for the listeners one wants to attract involves now very large sums of money for facilities, for radio staff,

and for radio contributors of a calibre equal to others presenting programmes of the same type."

Do you think in order to put educational broadcasts across, so to speak, that it has to have some of the characteristics of showmanship?

MISS MacKENZIE: Yes, I definitely do, the programmes have to be attractive if the listener is going to listen for any more than a few seconds.

MR. COYNE: They have to be attractive in some other sense than presenting an educational thesis or talk?

MISS MacKENZIE: I think so. A certain number of talks just as they are, of course, are highly interesting but a steady diet of just talks representing educational programmes is not satisfactory.

MR. COYNE: Then, on page 7 in your Conclusion you put forward the idea that perhaps it is time for the nationally controlled broadcasting system and the universities to work together. Do you know whether there has to date been any -- has anything developed along those lines as yet in the way of liaison and co-operation between CBC and the universities?

MISS MacKENZIE: Not so far as I know except those which I have mentioned there, there is always a certain number of university people are asked to contribute programmes, there has also been occasional round table series from one university or another, but nothing on the scale that I am suggesting

as a possibility.

MR. COYNE: You have really in mind some sort of concerted effort between the universities and the CBC?

MISS MacKENZIE: Yes, I think it would have great possibilities.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well now, in which direction would you have that develop? I would like to have you and Dr. Johns expand on this if you can with more positive suggestions if you have them. Are you thinking -- take your sentence further along on page 7:

> "The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has the facilities at its command and a duty of public service."

Would your thought be that under that duty, the duty of public service in educational broadcasting, you think they should go so far as to require the carrying of its occasional broadcasts by private stations?

MISS MacKENZIE: Dr. Johns, would you care to answer that?

THE CHAIRMAN: I am not trying to put you on the spot at all.

MISS MacKENZIE: I am still thinking.

DR. JOHNS: I think the end could be gained without the use of force. There are many educational broadcasts now and we feel that it will go on; for instance, if it was on a daily basis, and if public interest were investigated, I think it would be found to be very strong throughout Canada.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are thinking then in

this recommendation mainly looking towards the production of educational programmes, is that correct?

DR. JOHNS: In response to a need or an interest throughout the country; I think that interest would have to be studied, the Canadian Association for Daily Education, the national body could look into that.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are to hear a brief from them.

DR. JOHNS: They will probably have something to say on that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, the problem of course is that there is no use producing the most wonderful programme in the world unless you get it out.

DR. JOHNS: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just taking in your own case, you are talking about the CBC which is a Dominion Government body, your station is owned by the provincial government and you are a provincial university. I foresee conflicts in this operation you are suggesting.

MISS MacKENZIE: If I might add, Mr.Chairman, I had thought, or we had thought, in discussion, for instance, that the CBC might through its own agencies, not through private stations necessarily, be interested in, we will say, detailing certain programme producers to each of the campuses who would be very closely in touch with the activities on the campus. They could work together themselves as a committee, you might say. There might be CBC producers detailed to the campuses of the four western provinces

and they would, I am sure, have the co-operation of the universities because there certainly is an abundance of material of great interest to the public available in the universities, and with the advent of television it seems to me there could be valuable and fascinating programmes produced.

THE CHAIRMAN: Of course, take television, I was really thinking of that mainly because of the variety of outlets, private and public, in radio, but in television at the present stage and probably for some time to come, as it is a very expensive thing to develop, you are going to have limited numbers of outlets, some publicly owned and operated and some privately owned and operated. Do you think there is any need, if this is a good thing, is there a need to put it out as part of the national service and make it go across this country or should this be on an entirely voluntary basis?

DR. JOHNS: If I might speak to that and perhaps refer to an earlier suggestion which you raised as well; you suggested there might be some conflict between the local provincial effort on the one hand and a national effort on the other. I think one of the troubles the university's local broadcaster is that they have come out at a time when other very popular national broadcasters are on the air, in some instances, and the burden of producing a constant flow of programmes of one kind or another each week is quite a responsibility, but if this was done on a national basis it means

that the conflict with other -- well, to be specific, one comes on at the time of the CBC news and naturally that is a pretty interesting programme, and we feel that putting one on at that time you do not get many listeners, whereas if it was done on a national scale the burden of any one institution would be considerably reduced and perhaps a more suitable time might be found, and the resources for the disposal of the broadcast would be much wider.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that is very helpful. Thank you both very much for presenting your brief, and we will consider it.

(Page 1983 follows)

SUBMISSION OF FARMERS' UNION OF ALBERTA

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief on our list is from the Farmers' Union of Alberta to be presented by Mr. A. W. Platt, the president, and Mrs. Olive Douglass is with him, I understand.

MRS. DOUGLASS: Mr. Chairman, I am Mrs. Douglass, and our president Mr. Platt was unable to be here, but I have a committee member, Mr. Seeley, who will assist me. My brief is not very long, and I would like to read it and then supplement the arguments.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will mark it Exhibit 83, and you are quite at liberty to read it.

EXHIBIT NO. 83: Brief of Farmers' Union of Alberta.

MRS. DOUGLASS: "On behalf of the Farmers' of Alberta we wish to thank you, Mr. Fowler and members of the Commission for the privilege of submitting a brief outlining the views of our farm people.

"The Farmers' Union of Alberta's submission of policy pertains to the future of television in Canada; having special regard to the interests of agriculture.

"The submission shall follow the terms of reference as set out by the committee of the Privy Council, which are interpreted in the following manner:

"1. That the control of frequencies or

channels continue to be under the Parliament of Canada.

"2. That the broadcasting and distribution of Canadian programmes shall continue to be a central feature of Canadian Broadcasting.

(a) Policies to be followed by CBC in its broadcasting activities.

(b) Adequate programming for Canadian people.

(c) Programming for agriculture.

(d) The place of private stations in this regard.

(e) Financial need for TV promotion in Canada.

(f) Other related matters.

1. Control under the Parliament of Canada:

"The Farmers' Union of Alberta supports in principle that TV in Canada be under the control of the Parliament of Canada in so far as the granting of frequencies and air channels are concerned.

"In the CBC Canada has a base on which to build. CBC therefore should continue to be the main framework, but competing private stations should be allowed sufficient authority to provide a variety of programming where the population warrants.

2. Broadcasting Continue to be a Central Feature of CBC:

"The supervision and ultimate control of

programming in Canada should be the responsibility of the CBC with enough freedom for the production of good programming by private stations.

"In Canada, freedom of speech in regard to TV must be zealously guarded. It can be foreseen that since TV is in its infancy in Canada, the influence of American highly financed lavish programmes produced by private companies, which can easily and cheaply be obtained in Canada, might monopolize the receiving public and tend to exclude or displace programmes of Canadian production.

"The Farmers' Union of Alberta commends the advance of TV in Canada and recognizes that Canada in the short period of three years has become the second TV nation in the world. This has been accomplished in spite of Canada's size with a sparse population spread over a great east to west expanse. We further commend the production and acceptance of Canadian programmes, which have to compete with many extravagant American programmes, produced to cater to the taste of 180 million people in that country. Hence we in Canada realize that the production of adequate programming must cost a great deal more per capita than it does in the U.S.A. because of the contrast of small population and large area.

(a) Broadcasting Activities in Canada:

"Air channels or frequencies belong to the public as a whole. They are kept in usable form by international agreement. Each nation must decide what is to be done about its broadcasting channels and how they are to be developed.

"The Farmers' Union of Alberta supports the CBC basic plan of public and privately owned radio and TV stations and feel that sufficient freedom should be given private stations to allow them to become effective competigion for CBC stations. This would stimulate better programme production in Canada.

"Good programmes utilizing Canadian talent and creative resources must be encouraged and promoted under CBC. This cannot be over emphasized because the natural channels of communication on this continent run north and south. The east and west channels are more difficult and it is less expensive to provide our receiving public with programmes from across the line. We must not allow any nation, however friendly, to unduly influence the Canadian public.

(b) Adequate Programming for Canadian People:

"In Canada we have over one-half million square miles and an expanse of 3,500 miles from coast to coast where live 16 million people with approximately 40 per cent engaged in agriculture and we have 5,300,000 school children under the age of sixteen years.

"Adequate and suitable programming should be provided to advance the education and culture of Canadians, to stimulate the development of all industries, to build a more progressive Canada.

"TV in Canada should have these main functions:

1. To inform.
2. To educate.
3. To entertain.
4. To inspire.

"(1) Information should be given accurately and impartially.

"(2) The Farmers' Union of Alberta commends the CBC for the excellent education programmes offered at all levels and for many purposes. We suggest that in extending both radio and television, consideration be given to the development of a programme to offer as much help as possible to those who could not complete their formal education, to those who are giving and receiving formal education, and to promote a programme of adult education.

"(3) Entertain -- The promotion of relaxation and good entertainment with emphasis placed on the planning of children's programmes, in which crime, violence, brutality and sadism are to be avoided as children are natural emulators. Viewers have recommended 'Disneyland', 'Howdy-Doody', 'Fury' and 'Lassie' as good

children's programmes.

"(4) Inspiration -- To advance cultural programmes suggesting to the viewer good music, good reading, good painting, etc.

(c) Programming for Agriculture:

"The CBC when planning programming production should keep in mind the industries of the country and since agriculture is the basic industry of Canada much emphasis should be placed on its expansion.

"Programmes that include the following should be continued and intensified:

"Development of as complete a farm marketing service as is possible for daily broadcasting from all outlets.

"Development of programmes to promote better farming methods and farm management, i.e. programmes that give farmers information on approved farm practices.

"Development of rural listening group programmes such as the National Farm Radio Forum and Citizens' Forum.

"Development of regular programmes of information valuable to the promotion of agriculture, that is, building good interrelations between urban and rural people.

"The promotion of appreciation of the co-operative way of life.

"At all times keep agriculture on a high

plane, with no belittling of the intelligence of farm people.

(d) The Place of Private Stations:

"In the field of TV the private stations have a very valuable role to play. They provide community services such as local weather reports, information of local interest, shows of local interest produced by home talent, that cannot be provided by a nationally owned station.

(c) Financial Need of TV Promotion in Canada:

"The Farmers' Union of Alberta wish to endorse the recommendations of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture inthis regard.

"We quote, 'The Canadian Federation of Agriculture recognizes that the amounts of money provided by the Government of Canada to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation for television broadcasting must be very considerable, and believes that they should be generous enough to effectively avoid the possibility that lack of funds might force the Corporation to fail in achievement of the objectives of a national radio system as set out by the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences. The basis upon which funds are provided, moreover, should be such that revenues may be known ahead of time with reasonable accuracy. While the operations of the Board shall at all times be subject to review by Parliament, it should be granted revenues on

a firm basis for not less than five years ahead, so that the Board can properly plan its operations'.

"Further we endorse the principle that set owners bear a share of the cost of developing TV in Canada, but do not favour the licensing of individual sets.

(f) Other Related Matters:

"The Farmers' Union of Alberta believes that while planning the promotion of TV in Canada, all those who take part should keep their sights on the future development of our country in its relationship to other countries. Programmes should be produced, bearing in mind the exchange or sale of Canadian produced programmes to other countries. Such programmes should feature:

(a) The building of good relations between Canada and other countries.

(b) The promotion of Canada and her people.

(c) The promotion of avenues of trade for Canadian products."

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you wish to add anything at this time?

MRS. DOUGLASS: No, I don't think so, unless my colleague would like to add something.

MR. SEELEY: No, I think not.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Mrs. Douglass, could you tell us a little more about the Farmers' Union

of Alberta; how many members does it have?

MRS. DOUGLASS: The Farmers' Union of Alberta -- and I would like to quote last year's figures, because we get them in on a yearly basis and we promote a drive in the fall, and last winter the weather held us up so that our membership is still coming in. We were 62,000 last year, and represented 51 per cent of the farm units in Alberta.

MR. de GRANDPRE: That is 62,000 families, or 62,000?

MRS. DOUGLASS: Members representing 51 per cent of the farm units -- like farm families. We also are the only direct membership farm group in Alberta. We are affiliated with the Federation as are other agricultural co-operative organizations.

MR. de GRANDPRE: But is your organization also associated with the farmers' unions in other provinces, or do you operate separately from one another?

MRS. DOUGLASS: Yes, we have what we term an interprovincial farm union council and we do co-operate, and any requests or applications we send to our Federal Government go through the interprovincial farm union council as well as to the Alberta Federation of Agriculture and the Canadian Federation of Agriculture.

MR. de GRANDPRE: This brief you are presenting today, was it submitted to the members or to the regional groups, or was it prepared by the executive committee and then adopted?

MRS. DOUGLASS: This has been prepared by a

committee set up to do so by the Board of the Farmers' Union of Alberta, and we got the feeling of the Alberta and the way they got the feeling of the people was that they sent out requests for wishes of the people and sent them direct to the committee, and the brief was based on certain requests and views.

MR. SEELEY: The entire membership was invited to submit any thoughts they had on the matter in connection with the brief.

MR. de GRANDPRE: And the brief represents the summary of the various thoughts you received from your members?

MRS. DOUGLASS: Yes.

MR. de GRANDPRE: I see that as a general theme you believe the CBC should continue to be the main framework in the television field as it has been in the radio field?

MRS. DOUGLASS: Yes.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Do I understand that you believe a national television system could operate and should have its outlets by publicly owned stations at various points, and when there are no publicly owned stations in any particular area it should take advantage of the privately owned stations in order to give service to the widest possible coverage?

MRS. DOUGLASS: Yes, that is the general idea. We feel that private stations -- let me put it this way, all of the agricultural people, because of the isolation of the people, probably would never receive it if the CBC didn't see that it was done,

and that is why we support the plan, with the private stations being allowed to assist.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You are also concerned about competition on the one hand and good programming on the other. How do you visualize this competition? Do you visualize it as an immediate step, or is it something that you contemplate for the future when all the areas, or most of the areas, of Canada will be covered?

MRS. DOUGLASS: I think it is a plan for the future as well as right at the time. It takes in both periods of time because we feel that the private stations do a very good service; the fact that they can promote local talent and give local weather reports. We feel if there is more freedom given to them to be able to compete with the CBC, that it would be a very healthy situation.

MR. de GRANDPRE: But these new stations that would compete with the CBC stations in any given area, would they be established in the near future or would they come only as an ultimate step in the development of television in Canada?

MRS. DOUGLASS: Our line of thinking is more or less along the same line of radio. Private stations with CBC in radio have their rights and are able to provide a programme that they feel is suitable to the people or that would gain a good listening audience, and we feel the private stations should have a similar right under the CBC as the radio stations have.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Do you feel any new private station which would be allowed to operate in any given area should carry some of the CBC programmes, or should it be entirely on its own?

MRS. DOUGLASS: No, I think they should be allowed to carry CBC. They do today, and in that way there could be a better coverage, especially to isolated people, because even the CBC may not go into the isolated parts of Canada.

MR. SEELEY: May I ask for a little clarification? Do you infer that you would coerce these stations into being forced to carry CBC programmes?

MR. de GRANDPRE: I am asking you, if there were two stations in any given area do you visualize one station would carry the CBC programmes and the other station would be entirely separate from the CBC network?

(Page 1995 follows)

MRS. DOUGLASS: Not in my mind.

MR. SEELEY: Not in mine, either.

MRS. DOUGLASS: I think just as in radio there should be a co-operation. The private stations do carry CBC programmes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, but they do that under a collaboration or co-operation, but also under a system under which the CBC requires them to carry it.

MRS. DOUGLASS: I feel we are still in favour of the same system.

MR. SEELEY: I think there are certain CBC programmes that the rural people of Alberta would certainly like to see on all broadcasting stations, but as to the method by which it should be brought about, that is another angle entirely.

MR. de GRANDPRE: The reason I was asking the question was that at some point you say there should not be too many regulations and on the other hand you want to be sure that there will be a certain amount of CBC programming. Do you want to leave it to the station as to whether they will carry it or do you think the CBC should force any private station to carry some of the CBC material?

MR. SEELEY: Of course, in Alberta we do not like the word "force" too well.

THE CHAIRMAN: Use my word, "require".

MRS. DOUGLASS: Would it be necessary? I mean, how is the set-up for radio? It is quite possible, is it not, you do not have to force them?

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me give you an illustration, if I may. Supposing there was a CBC programme

coming on, let us take the National News programme, which is said to us to be important to us to keep the whole of Canada informed as to what is going on throughout Canada, and that comes on at seven o'clock; supposing a private TV station is able to sell the time at seven o'clock to a commercial sponsor to make money on, should they be allowed to do that or should they be required to carry the National News programme?

MR. SEELEY: Well, I would like to answer that with another question; do you not think that station would be very unwise from a public point of view alone to refuse to carry the programme which was of national interest to the people of Canada?

THE CHAIRMAN: It might, but it might perfectly validly say, "We are in business and do not get paid for one programme and do get paid for the other."

MR. SEELEY: You can visualize such a danger.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it has been suggested to us as being a probable danger.

MRS. DOUGLASS: I think we mean this just as we say it. We want a certain amount of freedom for the private stations to build their programmes and choose their times, but, at the same time, we want enough control that it is enough to safeguard our nation, and who can better do it than our Government? I think that is the answer to it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have one question. On page 3 you say, the second paragraph under (a) on broadcasting activities in Canada; you are talking here, I think, about the importance of good

programming, and you say:

> "The Farmers' Union of Alberta supports the CBC basic plan of public and privately owned radio and TV stations and feel that sufficient freedom should be given private stations to allow them to become effective competition for CBC stations. This would stimulate better programme production in Canada."

Are you sure that is necessarily so? I do not say it is not so, but are you sure?

MRS. DOUGLASS: I feel any competition stimulates a better production, does it not? If you have competition you are bound to have to improve on what you are producing to compete with the other production.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, supposing for the sake of example, you had a private station start up, let us take that as an example; say a CBC station started up and was really sensational in its programmes, would that necessarily improve the quality of the programme?

MRS. DOUGLASS: Yes, I think it would. I think probably that is why we have so many lavish programmes produced in the United States, because of the competition.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, but what chance would the farmers' programme have if there were enough people wanting to produce the lavish entertainment

spectacular?

MRS. DOUGLASS: Yes, but we are not going all the way, if you notice by our brief, but sufficient freedom to allow a good stimulating force there.

THE CHAIRMAN: I see. Well then, one other question on the farm programmes. You mentioned at the bottom of page 4 and the top of page 5 the outline of the kind of farm programming you think should be developed and I think you were directing that entirely to the CBC?

MRS. DOUGLASS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then you come to the place of the private stations providing local weather reports, information of local interest, shows of local interest produced by home talent?

MRS. DOUGLASS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you think there is no place or function for the private station in the area of farm broadcasts?

MRS. DOUGLASS: Oh, no, definitely not, that is not what we believe. What we have in mind is that this local production of agricultural programmes, such as the sales of livestock, like the regular spring and fall sales, or horse sales; we have a private station and they go there and there is a show of that sale and the exhibition of whatever takes place locally.

THE CHAIRMAN: The real point of my question is that your section dealing with farm broad-

casts is entirely directed towards the development of programmes by CBC?

MRS. DOUGLASS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then you get into the private stations and you speak of them as mainly information of a local interest. I am just asking you if the private stations should not produce some farm programmes also?

MRS. DOUGLASS: The intent is, we are not objecting, we want to be covered in both places.

THE CHAIRMAN: It was not clear from your brief.

MRS. DOUGLASS: No, it is not, but that is the intent. I wonder if you could get what we mean about this at all times to keep agriculture on a higher plane? There was a complaint about the Jackson family being so illiterate, we felt it was an affront to agriculture. We have had resolutions coming in on that and we feel we must bring that out.

THE CHAIRMAN: In other words, you do not want the farm people to be talked down to?

MRS. DOUGLASS: That is right.

MR. SEELEY: The farm people of today I think are not illiterate. We are living in 1956 and we do not have too many illiterate people in Canada, but we still have them on radio programmes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you both very much. We will adjourn now until two-thirty. I should make this announcement now: we have four briefs to hear this afternoon, which is probably all we can

get through, and we will therefore need to sit tomorrow morning to hear the other two briefs. We will start tomorrow morning at nine-thirty, if that can be arranged, because I want to give them plenty of time for the presentation of their briefs.

---The Commission adjourned until 2.30 p.m.

- - - - - -

(Page 2001 follows)

RADIO-EDMONTON LIMITEE (C.H.F.A.)

THE CHAIRMAN : The first brief we have this afternoon is by Radio-Edmonton Limitée. Dr. Mousseau and Mr. Rémillard, we have your brief and we will mark it as Exhibit No. 84.

EXHIBIT NO. 84 : Brief submitted by Radio-Edmonton Limitée.

THE CHAIRMAN: I see that you were good enough to put your brief in French and in English and you may present it in any language as you choose.

DR MOUSSEAU : Je ferai plutôt un résumé du mémoire que j'ai apporté à la Commission.

Nous retrouvons des Canadiens français, qui font partie de l'une des deux races officielles du pays, dans tous les coins de l'Alberta: région d'Edmonton, région de Rivière-la-Paix, celle de St-Paul et Bonnyville et région de Calgary.

Il suffit de citer des noms tels que La-Vérendrye, Père Lacombe, pour se rendre compte que le groupe français a tenu une place prépondérante dans l'établissement d'une civilisation et d'une culture canadiennes.

Le point de vue culturel est une des notes dominantes de la vie et de nos organisations françaises de l'Alberta. Voici quels sont les cadres:

L'Association Canadienne-française de l'Alberta, qui groupe tous les Canadiens-français dans ses cadres.

L'Association des Educateurs Bilingues de l'Alberta, dont le but est de promouvoir la culture française par l'enseignement.

La Survivance: journal officiel du groupe français en Alberta.

Collège St-Jean: institution d'enseignement supérieur, affilié à l'Université d'Ottawa et à l'Université de l'Alberta, et plusieurs autres institutions d'enseignement secondaire.

Notre population est groupée dans une soixantaine de centres. Nous comptons sur une élite de première valeur, chefs laïcs et religieux.

Quelques notes sur le point de vue culturel en Alberta: Nous sommes d'avis que les deux grandes races devraient reconnaître que toutes deux ont droit à leur épanouissement dans ce pays.

Au nombre des réalisations culturelles des Canadiens français, notons: bourses d'études, cours de français, bibliothèques scolaires, librairie, etc. etc. L'oeuvre la plus importante est sans contredit celle de la radio française en Alberta.

Toutes ces oeuvres ont été accomplies grâce au courage, à la persévérance, aux sacrifices des Canadiens de langue française de notre province.

La Radio française en Alberta. Radio-Canada, dans le passé, a consenti à donner environ une heure de français par jour à son poste de Watrous. Ces programmes étaient diffusés dans des périodes où plusieurs de nos compatriotes étaient

incapables d'être aux écoutes.

De 1941 à 1944, les Canadiens français des provinces de l'Ouest étudièrent le projet de construire leurs propres postes.

En mars 1944, un permis fut accordé, celui de St-Boniface. Les autres furent remis à plus tard. On nous promettait les autres permis si St-Boniface avait du succès. On accorda le permis de CHFA en mai 1948.

Considérations sur le poste CHFA. Nature du poste CHFA. L'existence du poste CHFA marque un fait assez rare dans le domaine de la radio au Canada. Tout en détenant un permis commercial qui l'aide à vivre, il est avant tout et essentiellement un instrument de culture française.

Un autre fait à souligner est que le poste CHFA a été bâti par la population française de toute la province d'Alberta. Même ceux qui ne peuvent pas capter le poste ont généreusement fait leur part, dans le seul but d'aider la culture française. De plus, l'appui financier que tous ont donné à CHFA est totalement gratuit. On comprendra toute la signification de ce geste si on considère que le groupe français a donné pour son poste de radio plus de $150,000.00 pour la construction et généreusement depuis, de sorte que nous avons reçu à date $215,851.00 avec $16,000.00 de déficit sans dépréciation.

Le poste CHFA est la propriété de Radio-

L.L.

Edmonton Limitée et est géré par elle. L'ouverture officielle de CHFA eut lieu le 20 novembre 1949. Actuellement, nous comptons un personnel de dix-huit membres.

Le but du poste CHFA est avant tout et uniquement de promouvoir la culture française sous toutes ses formes et dans tous les milieux. Advenant des profits ils ne peuvent être utilisés qu'à promouvoir la culture française.

Une autre preuve que notre poste est essentuellement culturel, c'est qu'il aide à développer les talents locaux de nos compatriotes franco-albertains.

Le poste CHFA a apporté, en partie du moins, à notre population, cette culture française qu'elle désire vivement et qu'elle ne peut trouver que d'une façon très limitée en Alberta.

L'influence de notre poste s'est d'abord fait sentir dans tous nos foyers canadiens-français.

Le poste CHFA apporte un heureux complément dans le domaine de l'éducation de nos jeunes et supplée dans une certaine mesure aux carences de notre système scolaire. Il offre aux jeunes des programmes spéciaux quotidiens; il met à leur disposition un instrument propre à développer leurs talents; il popularise les festivals français; il pénètre dans les écoles; il fait participer ces écoles à une série de programmes.

L'influence de CHFA ne s'arrête pas à

l'école primaire. Aux étudiants plus avancés des écoles secondaires, des High Schools et de l'Université, il présente un instrument merceilleux de perfectionnement culturel. Nous avons même déjà organisé dans ce but des cours de français. De plus en plus, nos concitoyens d'autres origines sentent le besoin de développer la connaissance et la pratique du français. A ce sujet, CHFA offre une occasion unique à ses auditeurs.

Le rôle de CHFA trouve encore un plus vaste champ où s'exercer. Dans tous les milieux ethniques du pays, on se rend compte davantage de l'importance et même de la nécessité de la culture française, non seulement dans un Canada bilingue, mais encore dans les relations internationales. Par exemple, on voit certains journaux de l'Alberta qui, autrefois, étaient opposés à l'expansion du français, réclamer aujourd'hui une plus large part à l'étude des langues vivantes. Par ses émissions culturelles et autres, CHFA aide nos concitoyens anglophones et autres à élargir et perfectionner le champ de leurs connaissances. D'autre part, CHFA permet aux différents groupes ethniques de faire profiter nos auditeurs de la richesse de leur culture particulière. Par ses émissions régulières en langue polonaise, allemande, ukrainienne, juive et autres, CHFA travaille plus que tout autre à l'enrichissement culturel de notre pays.

Enfin, le poste CHFA s'est créé à travers

la province une réputation enviable pour la qualité de ses émissions, en particulier pour la haute tenue de ses programmes musicaux. C'est ce qui explique que, selon un rapport de la B.B.M., le poste CHFA compte, en outre de ses auditeurs canadiens-français, un nombre aussi considérable, sinon plus, d'auditeurs de divers langues.

C'est dire qu'au point de vue culturel canadien, notre poste joue un rôle de première importance en Alberta, dont il est le seul poste d'expression française. Et loin de créer la mésentente que certains redoutaient, CHFA sert à promouvoir l'harmonie et la compréhension entre tous les groupes ethniques, tout en travaillant au développement spirituel, moral et intellectuel de l'élément français de l'Alberta.

Situation actuelle de CHFA. Nous avons rappelé plus haut les origines et le but de CHFA, qui se classe d'abord et avant tout comme une oeuvre essentiellement culturelle.

Il fut établi parce que, en réponse aux réclamations du public franco-albertain, les autorités fédérales, et Radio-Canada en particulier, avaient toujours prétendu que seule une incapacité technique et financière empêchait de faire droit à nos justes demandes.

Au contraire, depuis six ans que nous existons, la preuve a été faite qu'une radio française était viable en Alberta. Et nous aurions pu

continuer à vivre normalement si une situation nouvelle, surgie depuis un an, n'était venue affecter notre entreprise de façon sensible, et cela pour deux causes:

1) Augmentation des concurrents:

Lorsque nous avons obtenu notre permis de radiodiffusion en 1948, il n'existait que deux postes commerciaux privés à Edmonton, auxquels s'ajoutait le poste non commercial du Gouvernement de l'Alberta, et celui de Radio-Canada.

Mais depuis, on a vu naître d'autres postes commerciaux à Edmonton même, à Red Deer, à Camrose et Peace River, qui pénètrent notre zone de rayonnement et affectent d'autant notre position commerciale, comme celle d'ailleurs des autres postes commerciaux d'Edmonton.

Il est à remarquer qu'Edmonton en est rendu aujourd'hui à compter plus de postes radiophoniques que Winnipeg, alors que sa population est moindre presque de moitié. Cette situation, dont nous ne sommes nullement responsables, met la radio française dans une position précaire.

2) Avènement de la télévision:

Une deuxième cause qui entre en jeu est la naissance de la télévision qui, elle aussi, affecte la santé financière de notre poste. Il serait superflu de nous étendre sur ce point qui saute aux yeux.

Ici encore, la radio française a subi

un dur contrecoup dont nous ne sommes nullement responsables.

En jugeant de la situation de la radio en Alberta, la présente Commission d'enquête devra donc tenir compte de ces deux faits qui échappent à notre contrôle mais dont nous subissons cependant les conséquences et elle nous aidera, nous avons confiance, à y apporter les remèdes nécessaires.

Conclusions: Je crois que le présent mémoire vous donne une idée assez juste de la situation de l'élément français en Alberta. Son importance doit être jugée non pas tant d'après le nombre de Canadiens-français que par la civilisation qu'ils représentent dans cette province, par leur passé, par les réalisations à leur crédit, par tout l'ensemble des organisations culturelles qu'ils maintiennent.

Par ailleurs, il n'est que juste que, dans les décisions qui seront prises, on tienne compte du fait que le bilinguisme, la bi-culture et le caractère bi-racial soient respectés partout, y compris notre province. Si l'on veut que le pays jouisse de la paix et de l'unité désirables, il importe que les deux éléments soient, partout au pays, sur un pied d'égalité de traitement.

En conséquence, nous suggérons:

1) Que les autorités reconnaissent de façon officielle, pratique et totale, le caractère bilingue de notre pays, même dans les limites de cette province. La radio d'Etat est un service fédéral

bilingue qui doit donner des services à tous les contribuables canadiens-français ou anglais d'un bout à l'autre du pays et cela sur un pied d'égalité. Actuellement, Radio-Canada ne donne pas à l'élément français du pays ce qu'il donne à l'élément anglais. Il y a dix-huit postes anglais deRadio-Canada d'un bout à l'autre du pays et seulement quatre du réseau français, dont trois sont dans la province de Québec. Un seul se trouve en dehors: celui de Moncton.

2) Que l'on accorde à l'élément français les mêmes facilités culturelles que l'on accorde aux autres groupes dans les autres parties du pays, comme par exemple à la minorité anglaise du Québec. Le réseau de Radio-Canada donne à cette minorité un service qu'il ne rend pas aux minorités françaises en dehors du Québec, à l'exception de Moncton, le seul poste proprement dit de Radio-Canada. La minorité anglaise du Québec est desservie par C.B.M.

Nous rappelons ici la recommandation faite en 1947 par le comité parlementaire de la radio:

"Vu que certaines parties du Canada ne bénéficient pas des programmes de Radio-Canada ou n'en jouissent que partiellement, votre Comité recommande que le programme d'expansion et de développement de la Société soit accéléré et que l'établissement d'un deuxième réseau français qui fournirait aux auditeurs de langue française des programmes alternatifs en français comme en ont ac-

tuellement les auditeurs de langue anglaise, soit mis dans ce programme d'expansion et de développement."

Afin de s'acquitter de leurs obligations, les autorités fédérales auxquelles incombe le devoir de desservir tout le public canadien, français aussi bien qu'anglais, devraient accorder à notre poste, étant donné les circonstances, les moyens de subsister adéquatement, puisqu'en cette province nous remplissons une charge qui, en toute justice et normalement, aurait dû échoir à Radio-Canada.

Cette aide des autorités fédérales pourrait prendre diverses formes:

1. Subvention annuelle:

Au cours du dernier exercice financier, Radio-Canada a dépensé treize millions de dollars pour la radiodiffusion sonore au Canada. En toute justice, une part équitable aurait dû aller aux postes français de l'Ouest, étant donné la population française des trois provinces. On dira qu'on nous donne le réseau. Même si on reconnaît que c'est déjà beaucoup, ce n'est pas suffisant. Radio-Canada peut et doit faire davantage afin de remplir ses obligations de service de radio bilingue au pays. Si Radio-Canada n'a pas eu les finances nécessaires pour bâtir, il peut au moins aider financièrement à maintenir ceux qui existent et qui furent fondés parce que Radio-Canada refusa de donner du français à nos compatriotes.

2. Location de nos facilités:

Un autre moyen de rendre justice aux contribuables français de notre province et d'aider leur poste de radio, c'est pour les autorités fédérales de louer des heures de radiodiffusion, soit de soutien, soit commerciale. Actuellement, Radio-Canada exige de notre poste plusieurs heures de périodes réservées. Ce serait simple justice, vu que la Société Radio-Canada subsiste à même nos impôts, qu'elle paie pour les émissions, même culturelles, qu'elle diffuse par le truchement de notre poste.

3. Vente commerciale :

Radio-Canada ne devrait diffuser certains programmes commandités et de haute qualité qu'à la condition d'inclure nos postes de l'Ouest. Par exemple, l'un des meilleurs programmes que nous avions dans le passé, "Nos futures étoiles", a été discontinué cette année sur nos ondes parce que les commanditaires, Canadian Industries Limited, n'ont pas voulu inclure CHFA au nombre des postes qui diffusent cette série. On nous prive par là non seulement d'un revenu financier mais encore d'une émission de première valeur.

Finalement, un mot sur la télévision. On souhaite que Radio-Canada épargne à la population canadienne-française de l'Alberta les mêmes difficultés qu'elle a dû s'imposer pour obtenir la radio sonore dans notre province. La Société Radio-Canada ne peut pas s'attendre à ce que, continuellement, l'on fasse des perceptions directes

afin d'obtenir les moyens culturels qui devraient être mis à notre disposition par l'Etat. Ces souscriptions que nous nous imposons pour le français sont onéreuses et, à un certain point de vue, injustes, car elles sont en somme une double taxe déguisée. Les autorités fédérales devraient donc prévoir la création d'un réseau de télévision française qui desservirait tout le pays. Dès maintenant, nous réclamons pour le groupe français de l'Alberta un traitement égal à celui que les autorités fédérales accordent aux groupes anglais d'un bout à l'autre du Canada.

Il ne faudrait pas conclure de ce mémoire que les directeurs de Radio-Edmonton Limitée souhaiteraient la disparition de la Société Radio-Canada, telle qu'elle existe actuellement. Nous reconnaissons que la Société a déjà admis la nécessité de servir les minorités et elle l'a fait. Cependant, nous croyons de grande importance qu'une Commission responsable au Gouvernement canadien continue à protéger les minorités. Nous souhaitons en même temps que dans un avenir rapproché, les Gouverneurs trouveront moyen de donner suite à nos justes réclamations.

THE CHAIRMAN : Do you wish to add anything ?

MR. REMILLARD : No, Sir.

Me deGRANDPRE: Dr Mousseau, il est indiqué, soit dans ce mémoire-ci ou dans l'autre, qu'il y a à peu près 56,000 Canadiens français en

Alberta. Voulez-vous nous dire la source de cette information?

DR MOUSSEAU : Les statistiques du recensement de 1951 du Gouvernement fédéral.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce que la majorité de ces gens parlent encore couramment le français ou s'il y en a parmi ces 56,000 qui ont graduellement perdu la langue française ?

DR MOUSSEAU : Je ne pourrais pas vous dire qu'ils ont perdu la langue française, mais certainement que la troisième génération s'exprime beaucoup plus mal que la première génération. Ceux qui arrivent du Québec peuvent parler français très bien, tandis que les autres qui sont allés à l'école anglaise ont encore un français qui a une valeur courante, mais avec des anglicismes. Je crois que les Canadiens-français indiqués dans les statistiques parlent le français, sauf de très rares exceptions.

Me deGRANDPRE: Ce ne sont pas seulement les Canadiens-français que ce chiffre indique: ça indique la langue parlée par les gens qui parlent le français ?

DR MOUSSEAU : Oui, parce qu'il y a beaucoup de ces gens-là qui ont des noms anglais.

Me deGRANDPRE: Pourriez-vous dire, docteur, dans quelle partie en particulier de l'Alberta se trouvent ces groupements français ?

DR MOUSSEAU : Dans trois groupes très distincts: le groupe d'Edmonton qui comprend une

douzaine de paroisses qui entourent Edmonton dans un rayon de 50 milles; et le groupe de St- Paul, qui dans un rayon de 50 à 90 milles doit avoir 50 paroisses; et le groupe de Rivière-la-Paix où il y a un nombre égal de paroisses, et ce groupe a augmenté graduellement depuis les cinq dernières années.

M. TURCOTTE : Où se trouve St-Paul?

DR MOUSSEAU : St-Paul se trouve à 150 milles au nord-est d'Edmonton, tandis que Rivière-la-Paix se trouve à 300 milles au nord-est d'Edmonton.

M. TURCOTTE : Et répartis en combien dans chaque ville?

DR MOUSSEAU : A peu près également à 20,000 dans chaque groupe. On compte à peu près 60,000 Canadiens-français maintenant; à peu près trois groupes de 20,000, grosso modo, 18,000 à 20,000, à peu près.

M. TURCOTTE : Est-ce que votre poste d'Edmonton atteint ceux qui sont éloignés, à Rivière-la-Paix?

DR MOUSSEAU: On a beaucoup de difficulté à atteindre Rivière-la-Paix. On l'atteint bien dans le jour mais la nuit il y a beaucoup d'interférence qui vient des postes américains. On a pensé mettre un relais, mais on ne peut pas le faire actuellement.

M. TURCOTTE : Vous ne pouvez pas le faire parce que vous n'avez pas les moyens?

DR MOUSSEAU : Oui. Au point de vue pécunier on n'est pas capable de le faire.

Me deGRANDPRE: Maintenant, vous avez indiqué que vous aviez principalement des programmes culturels. Est-ce que vous pourriez nous dire si ces programmes culturels s'adressent uniquement à la population française -- je ne parle pas de leur réception mais de leur conception -- est-ce que vous les créez de façon à atteindre les auditeurs d'une autre langue, ou si vous les créez uniquement pour atteindre la population française ?

DR MOUSSEAU : Nous avons des programmes culturels qui viennent de Radio-Canada, et les autres sont de notre propre cru. Maintenant, notre programme de diffusion des cours de français est fait en grande partie pour les élèves de High School, et on m'a dit de plusieurs sources que ce programme aidait beaucoup ces élèves à se faire l'oreille au français et à mieux comprendre ce qu'ils apprennent. Dans une sphère plushaute, beaucoup de professeurs de l'Université qui connaissent le français ou qui l'apprennent actuellement nous félicitent continuellement pour notre programme qu'ils écoutent avec plaisir.

Me deGRANPRE: Est-ce que ce sont des programmes musicaux dans lesquels vous intercallez des présentations françaises ou si ce sont des programmes parlés pendant une demi-heure ou un quart d'heure ?

DR MOUSSEAU : Ceux dont je viens de

parler, ce sont des programmes parlés. Dans les programmes musicaux, par exemple, avant de passer un opéra, nous donnons le texte de l'opéra en français. Ces programmes-là ont été très appréciés par des gens qui m'en ont parlé.

Me deGRANDPRE: Maintenant, est-ce que le poste détient une licence commerciale ordinaire ou si le poste ne détient qu'une licence commerciale pour les programmes français ?

DR MOUSSEAU : Le poste détient une licence commerciale ordinaire. Quand nous avons demandé notre licence, nous avons demandé à Radio-Canada d'avoir un poste français seulement. Nous nous en sommes tenus à la lettre, au point que nous avons même traduit le chant de "God Save the Queen". On a toujours parlé seulement qu'en français au poste CHFA; jamais anglais.

Me deGRANDPRE: Il n'y a jamais un seul mot d'anglais sur les ondes ?

DR MOUSSEAU : Non.

M. REMILLARD : Si vous permettez. Lorsque le premier ministre, M. St-Laurent, est venu ici, on a parlé en français et en anglais; ç'a été quelque chose de spécial; mais notre licence est pour diffusion en français seulement.

Me deGrandpré: Est-ce qu'il y a une restriction dans votre licence ou si c'est simplement de la part du poste ?

DR MOUSSEAU : " To Broadcast in French only".

Me deGRANDPRE: C'est ce qu'il y a de marqué sur la licence?

DR MOUSSEAU : Oui.

Me deGRANDPRE: Vous indiquez également qu'il y a une grande proportion de vos auditeurs qui soient des auditeurs d'une autre langue. Est-ce que vous avez des chiffres assez précis à nous fournir à ce sujet-là ?

M. REMILLARD : Suivant le rapport de la B.B.M. nous avons 24,000 Radio-Homes, ce qui normalement doit être multiplié par quatre, ce qui fait 100,000 auditeurs qui nous écoutent pendant la semaine. Le jour, nous avons 8600 Radio-Homes, ce qui veut dire 32,000 auditeurs. Le soir, nous avons environ 19600 Radio-Homes, ce qui veut dire 80,000 auditeurs. Et l'année dernière la B.B.M. nous donnait un rapport des foyers anglais et des foyers français, et nous avions un gros pourcentage des gens qui parlent anglais, soit des Ukrainiens ou Polonais. Maintenant, nous avons eu la permission de Radio-Canada de diffuser des programmes en langue polonaise ou autre.

Me deGRANDPRE: Vous m'avez donné le nombre de foyers que vous atteignez par votre poste, variant de 18,000 à 100,000, le soir. De ces deux nombres, est-ce que vous avez la proportion des auditeurs de langue française ?

DR MOUSSEAU : On a 56,000 Canadiens-français et on a 80,000 auditeurs.

M. REMILLARD : C'est assez difficile

à dire, parce que ces sondages-là ne sont pas faits pour une langue en particulier, soit le français ou l'anglais.

Me deGRANDPRE: Vous avez, à certains moments, presque 50 pour cent d'auditeurs de langue anglaise, prenant pour acquis que tous vos auditeurs de langue française sont à l'écoute, ce qui n'est pas probable?

M. REMILLARD : Oui.

Me deGRANDPRE: Vous avez parlé de l'augmentation des concurrents dans la région, particulièrement à la page 10 de votre mémoire. Pourriez-vous nous indiquer comment cette augmentation du nombre de postes dans la région d'Edmonton a pu créer une concurrence à un poste qui est tout à fait différent des autres, étant donné que vous ne vous adressez qu'à une partie de la population?

M. REMILLARD : Nous dépendons des commanditaires locaux pour vivre. Alors, ces commanditaires locaux sont assez limités dans la région. Un commanditaire peut dépenser $1,000; il a cela dans son budget de publicité, et si un autre annonceur arrive, il nous coupera. Le marchand dira :"J'ai $1,000. à dépenser pour l'annonce, il y a un autre poste, je vais couper un peu." Au lieu de recevoir $500. nous ne recevons plus que $250.00. C'est une des explications

Me deGRANDPRE: Même si votre poste s'adresse à une population bien spécifique?

DR MOUSSEAU : On n'a pas la même va-

leur commerciale que les postes anglais, dans ce sens que les annonceurs disent que tous les Canadiens-français parlent anglais, et qu'ils vont répondre à une annonce anglaise aussi bien qu'à une annonce française. C'est extraordinaire qu'on puis se vivre actuellement.

M. TURCOTTE : C'est vrai que la grande majorité des Canadiens de langue française savent l'anglais, ici?

DR MOUSSEAU: Je pourrais dire 95 pour cent.

Me deGRANDPRE: A l'heure actuelle, je pourrais dire que la structure du poste de Radio-Edmonton est sensiblement la même que celle du poste français de Gravelbourg, dont nous avons entendu parler quand nous étions à Winnipeg. Maintenant, au point de vue proportion des programmes commerciaux et des programmes de soutien, pourriez-vous nous donner les chiffres pour les programmes commandités et ceux qui ne sont pas commandités, indépendamment des programmes que vous recevez du réseau français ?

M. REMILLARD : Nous recevons des programmes commandités du réseau français.

Me deGRANDPRE: Vous avez des programmes d'origine locale?

M. REMILLARD : Oui.

Me deGRANDPRE: Quelle est la proportion des programmes commandités et de soutien d'origine locale?

M. REMILLARD : D'origine locale, nous avons des annonces genre "Spot". Les programmes commandités localement sont une très petite proportion. Nous avons, par exemple, deux programmes d'une demi-heure, le soir, commandités, actuellement; et nous avons environ quatre programmes de 15 minutes, le soir, commandités. Le reste, ce sont des programmes dans le jour, des programmes féminins, pendant lesquels les commanditaires locaux prennent des annonces "Spot".

Me deGRANDPRE: Vous avez très peu de programme d'une durée d'une demi-heure ou d'un quart d'heure qui sont commandités?

M. REMILLARD : Oui, nous n'en avons qu'un très petit pourcentage, parce que c'est difficile à vendre.

M. TURCOTTE : Quelle est la nature des programmes de 15 minutes ?

M. REMILLARD : Nous avons un programme :"L'Orchidée du mérite". C'est un programme pendant lequel nous donnons les détails de la vie d'un de nos pionniers, et nous lui envoyons une orchidée. Il y en a d'autres, comme "La chasse à l'inconnu", un genre de "Twenty Questions".

M. TURCOTTE : C'est commandité?

M. REMILLARD : On peut trouver des commanditaires. Evidemment, le tarif est plus bas en comparaison avec les postes de l'endroit.

Me deGRANDPRE: Maintenant, quand vous recevez des programmes du réseau français, si le

programme est un programme commercial, vous recevez un certain honoraire pour le temps de l'émission?

M. REMILLARD: Oui.

Me deGRANDPRE: Et si c'est un programme de soutien, est-ce que vous recevez quelque chose ?

M. REMILLARD: Rien du tout .

Me deGRANDPRE: Ca fait partie du service que vous donne Radio-Canada, comme débouché ici?

M. REMILLARD: Oui, et nous avons des périodes obligatoires de Radio-Canada. Nous prenons 32 heures du réseau. Pour les programmes commandités de 15 minutes, nous recevons environ quatre dollars.

Me deGRANDPRE: Quand vous vendez à un marchand local, combien le vendez-vous ?

M. REMILLARD: Ca dépend de la classe. Le soir, c'est plus cher; c'est environ quatorze ou quinze dollars.

Me deGRANDPRE: Vous recevez à peu près le tiers de la valeur du temps?

M. REMILLARD: Oui; il y a les lignes à payer, il y a toutes sortes de déductions. Quand nous recevons notre chèque pour 15 minutes, c'est quatre dollars.

M. TURCOTTE : Vous diffusez combien d'heures ?

M. REMILLARD: 116 heures par semaine.

M. TURCOTTE : Dont 32 viennent du ré-

seau français ?

M. REMILLARD : Oui, et nous en avons 30 en direct. Le local, c'est de la variété, "Local Life".

Me deGRANDPRE: Ce que vous appelez "Local Life", c'est ce que vous recevez de St-Boniface?

M. REMILLARD : Non, ce que nous réalisons dans nos studios: "L'Orchidée du mérite", etc.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce qu'il n'y a pas des programmes qui viennent de St-Boniface et qui soient passés sur les quatre postes en même temps?

M. REMILLARD : Non, parce qu'on ne nous permet pas d'avoir un réseau entre les provinces.

Me deGRANDPRE: Vous n'avez pas de réseau "St-Boniface-Gravelbourg-Edmonton"?

M. REMILLARD : Non. Nous faisons parfois des programmes enregistrés sur bande sonore que nous nous envoyons, mais nous n'utilisons pas la ligne qui sert à Radio-Canada pour émissions entre les provinces.

Me deGRANDPRE: Avez-vous demandé la permission à Radio-Canada?

M. REMILLARD: Oui.

Me deGRANDPRE: Quelle a été leur réponse?

M. REMILLARD: Ils ont dit qu'ils ne pouvaient pas accorder la permission de faire des réseaux inter-provinciaux.

Me deGRANDPRE: Même pour vos quatre

postes qui sont différents des autres postes ?

M. REMILLARD: Oui, parce que ça créerait un précédent.

M. TURCOTTE : Cependant, lorsque vous faites partie du réseau français qui émane de Montréal, vous faites partie du réseau?

M. REMILLARD: Oui.

Me deGRANDPRE: Je vois que vous suggérez que les programmes que vous transmettez comme programmes de soutien vous soient payés de la même façon que quand ce sont des programmes commerciaux, de façon à vous aider à boucler votre budget. Pouvez-vous dire à peu près combien ça peut représenter par année, cela?

M. REMILLARD: Si tous les programmes de soutien nous étaient payés par Radio-Canada?

Me deGRANDPRE: De la même façon que les programmes commerciaux.

M. REMILLARD: Si nous diffusons 32 heures par semaines, si nous nous basons sur $15. vous pouvez faire le calcul. Encore ici entrent en jeu les catégories de classes.

M. TURCOTTE : Ca vous ferait $25,000. par année ?

M. REMILLARD: A peu près cela.

Me deGRANDPRE: Evidemment, ça ne ferait pas $25,000. de plus parce qu'actuellement vous en recevez déjà une partie qui vous est payée?

M. REMILLARD: Oui, 4 programmes par jour, ce qui fait $16.00 par jour; 4 programmes

de 15 minutes.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce que, avec cette différence dans votre budget, ça vous permettrait d'atteindre la région de Rivière-la-Paix?

M. REMILLARD: Non, ça nous permettrait de vivre assez bien. Nous n'avons qu'un personnel de 18 membres. Nous pourrions donner plus de service, et nous n'avons pas calculé notre dépréciation dans les rapports financiers. Si nous calculions la dépréciation nous aurions un déficit beaucoup plus grand que celui que nous avons actuellement. La machinerie se détériore.

M. TURCOTTE : Vous opérez à déficit?

M. LE DR MOUSSEAU: On a toujours opéré à déficit, mais on a bouclé par les opérations.

M. REMILLARD: Nous pouvons payer les salaires, mais quant à s'améliorer, on ne peut pas.

M. TURCOTTE : Qui est propriétaire de Radio-Edmonton? Est-ce le même cas qu'à St-Boniface? Est-ce une souscription à fonds perdus?

DR MOUSSEAU : Oui.

M. REMILLARD: S'il y avait des surplus, l'argent servirait à développer nos talents locaux et améliorer le poste.

DR MOUSSEAU: S'il y a des profits, ils ne peuvent servir à d'autres fins qu'au développement de la culture française en Alberta.

Me deGRANDPRE: C'est une des restrictions de votre charte ?

DR MOUSSEAU : Oui.

Me deGRANDPRE: Maintenant, un dernier problème: c'est celui de la télévision. D'après les chiffres que vous avez donnés tout à l'heure, je comprends que ça prendrait trois postes pour atteindre les groupements français de l'Alberta. Est-ce exact?

DR MOUSSEAU : Je crois .

M. REMILLARD: Vous parlez de la télévision?

Me deGRANDPRE: Oui.

M. REMILLARD: Avec le système qu'ils ont, est-ce qu'il n'y a pas moyen de faire des relais?

Me deGRANDPRE: Un seul poste situé aussi centralement possible ne pourrait jamais atteindre tous les coins de ce triangle?

DR MOUSSEAU: Pas d'après ce qui est connu de la science en télévision.

Me deGRANDPRE: Un poste de télévision française ne semble pas viable ici. Est-ce qu'il y aurait des objections à ce qu'un poste diffuse partiellement en langue française et partiellement en langue anglaise?

DR MOUSSEAU: Actuellement, n'ayant absolument rien, tout le français qu'on pourrait nous donner à la télévision serait bienvenu par la population. Est-ce que le gouvernement veut faire de la télévision la même chose que la radio? Des annonces? Ou s'il veut la conserver au point de vue culturel? S'il veut la conserver au point de vue culturel on peut marcher avec la population. Trois groupes

disséminés de 20,000 chacun, ça demanderait actuellement trop de dépenses pour établir des postes séparés. Maintenant, si vous avez des réseaux qui s'établissent à travers le Canada pour rejoindre toute la population, la chose devient différente. Dans ce cas-là on pourrait demander que les deux cultures soient représentées et d'avoir des postes qui soient égaux les uns les autres, les uns en français et les autres en anglais, à travers le Canada.

Me de GRANDPRE: Je comprends que tel que vous envisagez le problème ici, en raison du coût d'établissement d'un réseau français et d'un réseau anglais de télévision, vous seriez prêts à considérer qu'un poste soit créé, un poste qui donnerait des programmes moitié français et moitié anglais?

M. REMILLARD: Ca serait certainement très apprécié de la population.

Me deGRANDPRE: Quelle était la situation, lorsque vous receviez des programmes moitié français et moitié anglais, de Watrous?

M. REMILLARD: La moitié a toujours été très faible. Nous avons eu une heure de français dans la matinée, et souvent il était difficile de l'entendre. Certaines régions pouvaient l'entendre mieux que d'autres. Ici, ç'a toujours été impossible de prendre Watrous de façon à ce qu'on puisse l'entendre et le comprendre. Depuis ce temps-là, C.B.C. a mis un poste à Lacombe. Dans ce temps-là il n'y avait rien qu'un poste dans les Prairies.

M. TURCOTTE : Où est Lacombe?

M. REMILLARD: A 90 milles au sud d'Edmonton. C'est un poste qui rejoint une grande partie de la population de l'Alberta.

M. TURCOTTE: C'est un poste très puissant?

DR MOUSSEAU : C'est un poste de 50,000 watts. Celui de Watrous avait été installé pour desservir les trois provinces de l'Ouest.

M. REMILLARD: A Lacombe, c'est le transmetteur de C.B.C. Le poste est à Edmonton.

(Page 2028 follows)

THE CHAIRMAN: I think this arises on the last question Mr. de Grandpre was asking you; in turning to page 12 in the English text of your brief you say:

> "The authorities give official, practical and complete recognition of the bilingual character of this country, even within the boundaries of this province. State radio is a bilingual federal service which should be extended to all Canadian taxpayers, be they English or French, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and this on an equitable basis."

Then you draw a difference between the service to the French-speaking people of Alberta as compared to the English-speaking people of Quebec. You will admit there is a problem of languages here.

MR. MOUSSEAU: Well, we do admit that the literal statement that it should be extended to all Canadian taxpayers be they English or French from the Atlantic to the Pacific on an equitable basis ---

THE CHAIRMAN: It may be quite difficult to achieve.

MR. MOUSSEAU: Well, in Quebec City CBC has a radio station for 15,000 English people.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Is there an English station in Quebec?

MR. KEDDY: The English language station in Quebec City was established by private applicants and is connected to the Trans-Canada network

at their expense.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: It is not a CBC station?

MR. KEDDY: No CBC station there.

THE CHAIRMAN: I was drawing the point that while the objective is generally accepted as you state here, the actual realization is limited by problems which are very real in this field?

MR. MOUSSEAU: They are very real.

THE CHAIRMAN: One other question: towards the end of your brief, it is a question of fact, you say, that the Canadian Industries Limited programme "Nos Etoiles Future", which I take it you used to carry on your station, is not now carried; may I ask if there are other stations in Alberta that do carry that programme?

MR. MOUSSEAU: No, this was in French and we were the only ones to carry it.

MR. REMILLARD: This was the sustaining programme and it was sponsored, the moment it was sponsored they took it off.

THE CHAIRMAN: You think they could do a better selling job than they have been doing?

MR. REMILLARD: Well, if it was interested -- it was understood that the CBC would sell CHFA with the time included in their own basic station then there would not be a problem.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me get one fact straight; this programme, Singing Stars of Tomorrow, is that done in both French and English?

MR. REMILLARD: Yes, when the programme was sustaining it was in French and English. It originated in Montreal and the other one originated in Toronto.

THE CHAIRMAN: When it was taken over by a commercial sponsor?

MR. REMILLARD: I believe they have two announcers on there, and it is the same programme, or is it?

MR. KEDDY: There are two separate programmes, one in Toronto and one in Montreal.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, well if they are separate programmes there is no other station to carry the French so it was the decision of the sponsor not to buy this station?

MR. REMILLARD: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: We thank you both for your brief and we will give it consideration.

MR. MOUSSEAU: Thank you very much.

SUBMISSION OF l'ASSOCIATION CANADIENNE-FRANCAISE de l'ALBERTA

MR. DECHENE: Mr. Chairman, may I ask Mr. Remillard to sit beside me because he is our expert in these matters.

THE CHAIRMAN:

EXHIBIT NO. 55: Brief of l'Association canadienne-francaise de l'Alberta.

(Page 2031 follows)

ASSOCIATION CANADIENNE-FRANCAISE DE L'ALBERTA

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief is from l'Association Canadienne-française de l'Alberta, represented by Mr. André Dechêne, Q.C., We will mark your brief as Exhibot No. 85.

EXHIBIT No. 85: Brief submitted by l'Association Canadienne-française de l'Alberta.

M. DECHENE: Monsieur le président, messieurs les commissaires. J'ai l'honneur de me présenter à vous en ma qualité de président général de l'Association Canadienne-française de l'Alberta. Au nom de cette organisation il me sera permis, je crois, de souhaiter de la part des Canadiens de langue française qui habitent cette province, une cordiale bienvenue à vous, monsieur le président, et aux membres de votre Commission, ainsi qu'au personnel administratif de votre Commission. Votre réputation de citoyens éminents et distingués du Canada vous a précédés chez nous. C'est donc en toute humilité, mais avec grande confiance que nous nous présentons devant vous.

Les Canadiens-français de l'Alberta ne sont pas très nombreux comparés à la population totale de la province. Ils sont cependant des pionniers de cet Ouest canadien et ont joué un rôle important dans le développement de ce territoire doté par la Providence de tant de richesses, de fécondité et de beauté. Au début, ils formaient tantôt la majorité des résidents de ce nouveau pays, tantôt

une large proportion de sa population. Aujourd'hui nous avons une proportion plus petite, parce que nos nombres, tout en augmentant, n'ont pas reçu de renforts comparables à ceux de nos amis d'autres langues.

Nous croyons cependant faire une oeuvre importante pour l'unité du Canada et la culture de notre pays en maintenant notre langue, notre culture dans cette Province qui n'aurait autrement à peu près pas de contact avec l'élément français du pays.

Notre mémoire est déjà entre vos mains et vous en avez pris connaissance. Il répète, d'ailleurs, les suggestions faites par les postes français de l'Ouest.

J'aimerais cependant faire une précision qui s'impose, je crois, à la suite d'une question posée par Me deGrandpré, concernant les propriétaires du poste CHFA. Au point de vue légal, il y a certaines distinctions dans l'organisation des postes dans les trois provinces. Au Manitoba et en Saskatchewan, nous comprenons qu'il y a un grand nombre d'actionnaires répartis dans la population française, basés sur cette même souscription dont nous parlions tout à l'heure. Ici, nous avons onze actionnaires. Ces onze actionnaires sont aussi directeurs du poste et ils ont été élus par un congrès de l'Association que je représente aujourd'hui; et ces onze actionnaires détiennent leurs actions en fiducie pour l'Association, et en cas de décès ou de banqueroute, l'action retourne à l'Association qui choisit un

successeur.

Je n'ai pas l'intention de répéter le mémoire en entier, et je me contenterai d'en faire un résumé; et puisque la majorité de l'auditoire est plus familier avec la langue anglaise, vous me permettrez de continuer en anglais.

(Page 2034 follows)

THE CHAIRMAN: We will be very happy to hear you in either French or English, just as you wish.

MR. DECHENE: "L'Association canadienne-francaise de l'Alberta, which as President I have the honour to represent before the members of this Royal Commission, unites the 56,000 French Canadians living in this province and is their official spokesman. It could perhaps be defined as follows:

'An Association, the principal aim of which is to propagate by every possible means among the French-speaking Albertans, all that might tend to favour French culture.'

"Its secondary object might well be to unite the French Albertans from the economic, national and social point of views as well as from the point of view of language.

"Founded in 1925, it has since acquired organizations or committees which allow it to pursue these different aims. Thus, for example, it has an educational committee to foster and superintend the teaching of French in Alberta schools. It unites the teachers of French in its Association bilingual educations of Alberta."

Notwithstanding conditions that may appear unfavourable in this province, there still exists people of French origin who have remained faithful to their origin and who have the intention of transmitting

to their children the culture which is their own, without neglecting the study of the English language. In doing so they have the conviction they are making an important contribution to Canadian unity and Canadian culture. In 1931 it was decided by the Supreme Court of Canada,a decision affirmed by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, that radio was a federal responsibility in Canada. We asked for what we considered a fair share of radio broadcasting in French. The Canadian Broadcasting Commission, as it then was, recognized this bilingual feature and made various promises to guarantee it. The most we ever had was one hour in French on radio station CBK-Watrous, and the reason given was the reason raised by the Chairman a few moments ago -- the financial problem. Having that in mind we decided to finance our own station, and we did that as has already been stated in the previous brief.

Now, for the reasons previously indicated, while we are in no immediate danger of financial collapse, we are having a difficult time and we feel that the CBC, or any other body responsible for radio in Canada, should assume part of the responsibility for the provision of French radio in Western Canada, and the other stations as well as our own have indicated various means by which that end could be carried out; either by straight subsidy -- which may be a bad word -- or by renting our time and by the use of our station as a CBC outlet for which it would be paid.

In so far as television is concerned, the Association which I represent shares the views expressed already, that we are hoping that something can be done either in co-operation with the existing radio stations or otherwise to give some French coverage to this part of Canada. We recognize the financial and technical difficulties, but we think whoever is responsible for television in this country should bear in mind the necessity for some French language shows in this province.

THE CHAIRMAN: On that last point, you end your brief on television by saying, "If private stations were required to give a generous share to the French language in the preparation of their programmes, until the Government can itself establish a French network in the West . . ."; have you any opinion as to what a generous share would be?

MR. DECHENE: Well, of course, that is largely a matter of opinion, but we will certainly recognize that it would hardly be fair to impose on a private station a large percentage or even a fifty per cent requirement of French programmes, but we do think as long as the private station is in some way responsible to the CBC, or at least regulated by the CBC, that some method may be arrived at of having the occasional French programme at regular intervals. I don't think we would be found too exacting in this matter.

THE CHAIRMAN: You want, I take it, recognition of the principle to begin with?

MR. DECHENE: That would be it.

THE CHAIRMAN: And, secondly, a fairly regular chance to hear programmes on television in French?

MR. DECHENE: That is it.

THE CHAIRMAN: And your group would be prepared that until such time as there were French networks that the controlling powers of the CBC would be exercised over the private stations to do this?

MR. DECHENE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: One other question; at the bottom of page 6 in the English version of your brief you say:

> "If on the one side this French network has brought us a certain number of programmes far superior to those which we might have produced locally, there is no doubt that a certain number of others, either concern subjects which are but of little interest for our people in the West, or treat them in such a manner that they are too learned for ordinary common people. If at least, we were permitted to choose the programmes which suit us, we would be much happier."

What is your thought there?

MR. DECHENE: That, Mr. Chairman, refers to the seventeen hours a week which are imposed upon us as a CBC network station which we have to

take whether we like it or not. We understand that in the province of Quebec, CBC recognizes that some of those programmes are not particularly popular with the general population and are directed towards an elite. I refer to the series of programmes "Radio College". These are the programmes imposed upon us here, and our thought on them is that too often they are not particularly adapted to the West. Secondly, they are too learned in that they are not easily understandable or followed by that portion of our population which is not too well educated.

THE CHAIRMAN: But as a technical matter how would you be able to take part in the choosing of your programme?

MR. DECHENE: Well, the simplest thing in the world; we are connected to the network, and the programme comes into our station every day, seventeen hours a day, and those programmes which we do not take either because they are commercial programmes not sold on our station which we cannot take, or they are programmes which we do not want because they do not fit into our time table, we just press a button and they are closed off and we supply our own local programmes.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are saying that the so-called compulsory seventeen hours a day, you would like to be able to choose more of the programmes on that seventeen hours?

MR. DECHENE: Yes.

MR. de GRANDPRE: But on this same line of

thought you realize this will mean the creation of a separate set of rules for your station from the rules which would apply to other stations?

MR. DECHENE: It probably would, but our station is far removed from Montreal and we think the same set of rules could apply to the three prairie provinces which have the same problem.

MR. de GRANDPRE: It was mentioned in Winnipeg that Winnipeg should be a clearing house or screening centre for the French network programmes being carried on the western section of the French network: that is, in substance, what you are advocating today?

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't know whether they are saying they would let Winnipeg do that or not.

MR. DECHENE: There is also this further problem, that that could be done provided they used our time.

MR. de GRANDPRE: I am not talking about the centre where the screening centre would be, but the general principle of making the western section of the French network more adapted to your needs or your tastes?

MR. DECHENE: Yes, something like that might be the solution.

MR. de GRANDPRE: I think Mr. Dechene has given the answer in his opening remarks when he said that most of the brief was already covered by the previous brief, and therefore I have no further questions.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: This station in Edmonton does not reach easily all the French-speaking people in Alberta?

MR. DECHENE: That is one difficulty we have. It is a technical problem, that we cannot have enough power from Edmonton to serve the Peace River country.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Has your Association at any time approached some of the private stations in those localities like Peace River or St.Paul to try to get some time either gratuitously or paying for it; have you ever approached any of them in the hope you would get some service?

MR. DECHENE: No. There is no station in St. Paul. There is one in Peace River which is of fairly recent origin, and we haven't approached them.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Well then, you have not been turned down?

MR. DECHENE: That is true. That is, of course, a private station.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: CBX does not reach there either, assuming it gave the programmes in French?

MR. DECHENE: It is an evening problem. We reach the Peace River district up to six or seven o'clock at night, and then the San Francisco station comes in and we are buried underneath.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are a 5-kilowatt station?

MR. DECHENE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: And CBX is 50?

MR. DECHENE: Yes. We are beamed to reach

the Peace River and St. Paul district.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. I think you can feel you are gaining ground in the way in which the French and English languages are being integrated on your own performance here. I wish I could do as well in both languages.

MR. DECHENE: Thank you, sir.

SUBMISSION OF THE ALBERTA PROVINCIAL COMMITTEE LABOR-PROGRESSIVE PARTY

THE CHAIRMAN: We will mark your brief to start with as Exhibit 86.

EXHIBIT NO. 86: Brief of Alberta Provincial Committee, Labor-Progressive Party.

MR. TUOMI: Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, I regret very much that the gentleman who was to submit this brief for us is unable to be here. I was only to appear as his assistant. I do not feel that I can give the expert advice on a number of technical problems you may be interested in, and I would like to read the brief only and file it with you.

"Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission:

The Alberta Provincial Committee of the Labor-Progressive Party welcomes this opportunity to present the views of our party's membership and of its supporters on the important question of television broadcasting. To us this question is part of the whole problem of Canada's all-

round development and growth as a nation.

"The main issue before your Commission, as we see it, is this: Shall Canadian TV be controlled by the CBC and parliament or shall its 'commanding position' be under private commercial control? Shall its aim be that of serving the people and the nation in the promotion and development of Canadian talent and culture, or shall it degenerate into a commercial advertising medium with profits as its main concern and increasingly dependent on American TC imports with a consequent degradation and destruction of our national culture.

"The Alberta section of the Labor-Progressive Party believes that public control of TV is necessary in the national interest.

"In our opinion CBC-TV has made a distinct and worthwhile contribution to Canadian culture and to Canada as a nation. It has helped to reduce crass commercialism, to promote Canadian talent and develop a justified pride in Canada and things Canadian. Its Canadian-produced programmes and its regulatory powers have prevented Canadian TV from becoming merely an outlet for American TV. Fur and Feather, On Camera, The Plouffe Family, Pick the Stars, Grey Cup Games, Wayne and Shuster, Country Calendar and Perspecitive are entertaining, interesting and educational -- a credit to Canada, the CBC and the National Film Board.

"CBC has also brought some popular and entertaining TV programmes to Canada from the USA, among which are Disneyland, Our Miss Brooks, Caesar's Hour, the Ed Sullivan Show, etc.

On Criticism of CBC-TV:

"The CBC is, however, not without its serious weaknesses and shortcomings.

"It has permitted TV stations to carry, and sometimes has itself imported, so-called children's shows which feature violence such as Roy Rogers, Rin Tin Tin and the Lone Ranger. It has permitted and sometimes imported shows which feature crime, such as Dragnet. It is now permitting that example of vicious racism -- the Amos and Andy show. We have the humiliating spectacle of a U.S. navy propaganda show -- Navy Log -- being used as promotion for the Canadian Navy!

"CBC-TV has not joined with public organizations such as the Alberta Government's Advisory Board on Objectionable Publications in [illegible] up yet another channel that influences our children's thinking on crime, violence and race prejudice. It has in fact worked against the worthy objectives and the good results won in the fight against the harmful effects of such things as the crime 'comics'.

"One of the reasons for bringing in a large number of American shows may be the inadequate funds for the production of good, suitable Canadian shows, and that is a problem that this

Commission will no doubt cover in its recommendations. Our criticism here is made with the object of helping to improve the programmes of CBC-TV.

"But there is another type of criticism of the CBC that we think is dangerous to the development of Canadian broadcasting as an avenue for promoting Canadian talent and culture. We in Edmonton have an example of it in editorials in the monopolist and abjectly pro-American daily paper.

"In an attack on the powers of the CBC on May 2, the paper said:

> '. . . the vast majority of Canadians do not listen to CBC programmes -- though they have to pay for them. . . . a considerable number of these programmes are not only boring but offensive . . . it is run by and for a small 'arty' minority. . .'

"Two days later, on May 4, in another attack on the CBC, it said:

> 'Its programmes make little or no appeal to the vast majority of Canadian listeners and viewers. The unpopularity of the CBC offerings is partly the result of clumsy, amateurish writing, direction and acting. In an even larger measure, however, it is due to the fact that the Corporation's

> programming, especially in television, seems to come under the control of a clique of 'arty' Greenwich-Village type intellectuals who are determined to give the public, not what it wants, but what they think it ought to want. Their work has nothing Canadian about it, but is for the most part a feeble imitation of foreign models; it alternately bores and outrages the average viewer.'

"This type of criticism, in our opinion, is not inspired by a desire to improve Canadian TV and to have it serve our country. It is the type that tells Canadians that our efforts are second-rate; that we are second-rate, and that our country is second-rate. It needs to be rejected from any serious study of what we need and how we are going to get it.

"We do not believe that everything that the CBC has produced is good. Far from it. But it is one thing to criticize with the object of improving and quite another thing to criticize with the object of destroying. The latter is what we think a whole group in Canada, with which the daily paper here allies itself, wishes to acomplish -- the abolition of the CBC by stripping it of its powers.

"Aside from the fact that what the editorials said is an insult to the many and fine Canadian

actors and artists who have appeared on CBC programmes, the simple truth is that millions of Canadians do listen to CBC radio and watch CBC-TV programmes and enjoy them.

"We suspect that this devastating type of criticism is inspired by the desire to get unbridled control of radio and TV by private interests, a development which would no doubt increase the profits of privately-owned radio and TV stations, but which would have a detrimental effect on Canadian culture.

"The paper here also strongly urges support for the proposal to establish a separate regulatory board, independent of and over the CBC. It is argued that the CBC is a monopoly and that it uses its powers to foster its own programmes. We think this sort of charge comes with ill grace from a newspaper that has secured for itself a complete monopoly in the city of Edmonton.

"Speaking on May 16, 1932, on the bill to incorporate the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Commission (the predecessor of CBC), the then Prime Minister, the late Honourable R. B. Bennett, declared in the House of Commons:

> 'First of all, this country must be assured of complete Canadian control of broadcasting from Canadian sources, free from foreign interference or influence . . . Secondly, no other scheme

than that of public ownership can ensure to the people of this country without regard to class or place, equal enjoyment of the benefits and pleasures of radio broadcasting.'

"To us these principles are as correct today as they were in 1932, and apply with equal force to TV as radio. We believe that TV and radio should serve the national interests by helping to create among Canadians an image of themselves as a democratic, peace-loving people with a proud heritage and a glowing future.

"We had a survey of Edmonton TV shows made some two months ago and found the following to be an approximate division of programme time:

1) Local Live Production This includes newcasts, sports, weather, kitchen and women's shows, children's programmes	17 hrs out of a total of 68 hrs per week, or 25%
2) CBC Produced These are shows of CBC origin including talks, drama, comedy, etc.	17½ hrs. or 26%
3) CBC Handled These are usually US produced, for example Dragnet, which have been edited and shipped through CBC facilities	15 hrs. or 22%
4) Agency or Station Handled These are usually of US origin and are imported directly by the local station or by advertising	12 hours or 17½%
5) Movie Nights Usually old films run as late evening features on Friday or Saturday nights	3 hours or 4½%

6) Others — 2-3½ hours or 4½%
Old cartoons, National Film Board releases, etc.

"In our opinion, local TV does far too little in promoting local talent. Our city and district has many fine singers, dancers and other artists including those of the various language groups who could provide very enjoyable and colourful programmes.

"There needs to be a greater use of National Film Board materials. They are totally inadequate now. There is even a list of prize winning films put out by the Department of National Health and Welfare that could be used. These, as Canadian films, deserve more than a part of 4½ per cent of a week's programming.

"We estimate that about two-thirds of local time for the drama-comedy type of entertainment is American produced. We believe that more CBC materials should be used.

"The old films used on the Friday and Saturday night shows are of a buck-board vintage and should be put out to pasture.

"The local TV station did not carry a single one of the World Olympic hockey games that our Canadian team took part in last winter in Italy. The station does not carry any of the NHL games. Edmonton hockey fans have had to tune in on a 15-minute show called Madison Square Garden to get occasional glimpses of our excellent Montreal Canadiens or Toronto

Maple Leafs in action. Nor have Edmonton TV viewers seen a WHL game televised. It is to be hoped that the CBC will require all TV stations across Canada to adequately cover Canadian participation in the summer Olympics in Australia and the world championship hockey games in the Soviet Union next winter.

"To us the shortcomings that we find here in TV demonstrate the need of closer CBC supervision of TV programming. Efforts here should be directed to more Canadian programmes, more local talent of the best calibre being used, in providing programmes that integrate us closely into across-Canada activities, all in a conscious and concerted drive to get Edmonton TV viewers to see themselves as Canadians and not merely an audience at American shows.

"We are sure that Edmonton, Calgary and Lethbridge TV viewers would like to have a choice in TV programmes, instead of being limited to the one channel. That choice could best be served by the establishment of a CBC-TV station in Alberta. Among other things it would do for us, it could utilize and encourage Alberta talent. We urge that your Commission recommend this to Parliament. Those areas that are presently not served by existing TV stations could be serviced by booster and relay stations, utilizing the microwave set-up if possible.

"We believe that the people of Alberta

would like to take part in halping CBC radio and TV in its programming. We propose that consideration be given to forming citizens' advisory boards representative of a cross-section of our people and including such organized groups as the farm and labour movements.

"In our opinion the powers of CBC should, if anything, be increased rather than decreased, with the aim of producing more and better TV programmes about Canada and using Canadian talent, and making this available to the widest possible audience.

"On the all-important question of where the money is to come from, we favour the proposal that the CBC should be provided for, in the main, through statutory grants by Parliament. We do not favour the idea of licensing receiving sets.

"All of which is respectfully submitted."

(Page 2051 follows)

THE CHAIRMAN: I understood you to say that you wished to file this brief and were not in a position to answer questions?

MR. TUOMI: I feel I am not capable of giving any advice on technical questions or anything else. I regret that the gentleman who was to be here could not be here.

THE CHAIRMAN: I hope you will realize that just because there are no questions being asked does not mean that there were no questions to ask. I think perhaps we will break off for five minutes now.

---A short recess.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief we have is from the Alberta Federation of Agriculture presented by Mr. Roy Marler.

SUBMISSION OF ALBERTA FEDERATION OF AGRICULTURE

THE CHAIRMAN: We will mark your brief as Exhibit 87.

EXHIBIT NO. 87: Brief of Alberta Federation of Agriculture.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you present your brief, please?

MR. MARLER: Well, Mr. Chairman, our brief is rather lengthy and if it is agreeable to the Commission we are quite satisfied to take it as read and answer any questions that we can in respect to it, with the privilege, if it is agreeable, to

make a few comments at the outset.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think I would at least outline your brief. We have read it but it would be a good idea to skim through it anyway.

MR. MARLER: First of all, we deal with the possible effect of duplication, to installation of other networks and therefore an extension of stations, and we feel that duplication would lead not to cheaper service but to more expensive service which would result in fewer people being able to get the benefit of those services, and this is more particularly in respect to our people, the rural people of this province than to the urban people.

Now, we do not believe that complete government operation in all of our enterprises is what we want, but there are some services that are fundamental and in some cases more properly handled by the elected representatives and are practical and more economical in that way. We do not think in cases of that kind we should be prone to not accept anything that will benefit us in that respect, regardless of what category it falls under, whether it is to be public ownership or free enterprise, in considering a service and its cost and availability to our people. We cannot ignore the facts when we hear that we are gradually becoming conditioned to nationalization and that we will become nationalized before we know it. In our opinion we will not become completely nationalized unless we shut our eyes to the abuses of free enterprise and try to screen

those abuses by camouflage techniques, that free enterprise is being something that it actually is not nor never was intended to be. Rather it seems to us that there is plenty of room for Canadian people to work between these two extreme forms of national life, namely nationalization on the one hand and the abuses of free enterprise on the other. In fact, we are sure we can do this very thing within our country and have done so for some time. We no longer are building continental railways side by side within a stone's throw of each other; we are not building Trans-Canada highways side by side; we have not developed our air lines in duplication, creating a system where planes would be flying over the same routes carrying non-pay loads. Do not broadcasting and television fall properly in the same categories with respect to development and operation? Does not Canada, over the greatest obstacles, have the best development on operation of these services of any country in the world? Does not our record for broadcasting, and more particularly in the field of television prove that we can do this job?

Under some circumstances, if we are not prepared to face the facts, compare most of our services that we have undertaken on this basis when it has been found necessary in the best interests of our people, I think that our record is favourable when compared to any other country in the world in the field of these services. We have never looked upon the CBC as government wanted programme, rather

as a programme of development entered into willingly by all provincial governments and the Federal Government as a service requested by the people of Canada. We believe private stations are doing good work and are working under healthy conditions; we would oppose control being turned over to them. We have had both pleasant and unpleasant experiences with private stations, and with one station I might say both pleasant and good experience.

In the arena of broadcasting people must keep their guard up against a lead from the right hand as well as from the left hand. By that I mean that we do not need to necessarily divide our Canadian people into two extreme categories, left and right, rather there must be a great deal of room and I think we have found a great deal of room in the middle of the road for us to develop our way of life and our cultures and our broadcasting system to best serve the greatest number of people without necessarily fitting into the plan of either of these extremes.

Is there anything wrong? I think we should be prepared to ask ourselves is there anything wrong with our way of life today? We are naturally inclined to look at this question on the basis of past and recent developments in international affairs, and while we in our organization feel very favourable to our way of life, yet we think it would be wrong of us not to be willing to make any necessary adjustments to our way of life which would better serve our people as a whole. It seems to us that

in doing this we have to be open minded, we cannot take into consideration our personal thoughts in regard to our selfish needs or selfish satisfaction, nor can we take it into consideration on the basis of our policies of organization or the operation of our country, but rather it is something larger than that and that is what we have tried to do in this brief. We have tried to point out some of the experiences here in Alberta, and which are well known to you, I am sure, that have taken place in the past, some of the mistakes we have made in allowing free and open competition without restrictions and the extent that it has cost our people both here in Alberta and other places in Canada. I think we are getting away from that and we are making marked progress under our present system, and as we are prepared from day to day and year to year to make adjustments, I think that offers the best solution.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Coyne, have you some questions?

MR. COYNE: Mr. Marler, in your opening remarks I gathered that your organization feels that radio and television falls within the category of a public service operation, and, therefore, that you see no objection to public corporations playing a part in developing this public service?

MR. MARLER: Well, I would answer yes as far as broadcasting is concerned; I do not think I would like to include all businesses.

MR. COYNE: No, I was limiting it to radio

and television.

MR. MARLER: Yes, right.

MR. COYNE: The point of view has been put before us a number of times and Mr. Taylor this morning suggested to us this point of view, that there is an inherent danger to a democratic state in permitting a government body to exercise control over a medium of communication or of information, that perhaps was opening the door to government points of view and that sort of thing; do you feel there is any danger of that kind in an organization such as the CBC exercising control over radio and television?

MR. MARLER: I suppose there may be some danger but I certainly think there is much less danger than there would be to trust it to provincial governments without reference to any particular government or to private industry. I think that surely our members in the House of Commons devote their time to their constituents all across Canada and they represent different forms of religion, different races, do their best to guard our way of life, and that is why we feel that the CBC set-up, charged with the development and operation of broadcasting, responsible to the elected representatives in the House of Commons and ultimately the Government, is, I think, undoubtedly the safest way we can have it.

MR. COYNE: Do you feel that there is a distinction between a Corporation such as the CBC being responsible to Parliament as a whole, a distinction between that state of affairs and, say,

operation by a government department under a minister of the Crown?

MR. MARLER: Oh, yes, I do. I think when we are prepared to rest the distinction of our opinion in our elected representatives at the House of Commons that it is the responsibility of those in authority.

MR. COYNE: Have you given any thought to the difference between, say, radio and television broadcasting on the one hand and the press on the other? No one would seriously suggest, I do not think, that the press which is also a medium of communication, should be subject to direction by any public operation?

MR. MARLER: I think they fall into two categories.

MR. COYNE: Could you just explain that a little?

MR. MARLER: Well, I say, it has certainly been mentioned here already today, that we have a monopoly of the press here in Edmonton. Now, many of us, I think perhaps the owners of the daily press here in Edmonton would concur in this thinking, that we would rather have another daily paper, but notwithstanding what our wishes are in this respect, economics, through control of free enterprise, resulted in a monopoly in one paper. Now, I do not think we want that sort of thing to happen in broadcasting and television.

MR. COYNE: And do you feel that the existence of the CBC is likely to prevent that sort of thing happening?

MR. MARLER: I think it will. I will say this, I think the great majority of people have their minds formed much more rapidly by ear than by reading and gain more by sight than by ear.

MR. COYNE: Your organization is satisfied that the CBC, responsible as it is to Parliament, is not an organization that is going to endanger the way of life that you have spoken of?

MR. MARLER: I would like to put it this way: I think this is the safest safeguard we have the means of employing.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are choosing this as the least dangerous of the three or four possible dangers?

(Page 2059 follows)

MR. COYNE: Turning to your brief for a moment, if I may, you speak in several places of the fact that radio and television are particularly important to the rural people as media of information and adult education as compared to the urban people; would you care to expand on that a little?

MR. MARLER: Well, our thinking there is that generally speaking -- and this may be more particular to Alberta than any other province with the possible exception of Saskatchewan -- our rural people, at least the adult rural people of today who have been raised in this province, didn't have the same opportunity for an education through school, a book education, that our urban people had, and from that standpoint the radio,and again the television more so, has a very effective means of bringing to them directly many matters of importance such as international, national and provincial news, policies, government policies developed, experimental tests from our experimental farms and our universities, which is of big importance to agricultural people, and from experimental farms carrying on experiments which are primarily carried on for the purpose of agriculture in this province.

MR. COYNE: Do you feel the urban people have perhaps more alternative media, if you like, or more ready access to other media than the rural people?

MR. MARLER: Yes, absolutely. They have their parks and theatres around the corner; they

have good streets for cycling and this sort of thing that the rural people have not got.

THE CHAIRMAN: You mention also in your brief that there is also the matter that the getting of mail and newspapers is not as rapid as it is in the cities.

MR. MARLER: Yes, I think the percentage of farm homes who have a daily paper in Alberta is comparatively small. Most of the farm homes do take monthly farm and agriculture magazines and publications, but I think the percentage of daily papers is rather small.

MR. COYNE: So your point really is that radio and television are relatively more important to the rural than to the urban?

MR. MARLER: Yes, much more so.

MR. COYNE: Turning to page 3, the final paragraph -- and I am not sure that you have not already dealt with the point -- you say:

> "We appreciate that there are disadvantages to national control of radio being vested in a Crown corporation responsible to the elected representatives of Parliament."

I was going to ask you what you had in mind there as being the disadvantages; have we already discussed that?

MR. MARLER: I think in part, yes. I may add that I think some of the disadvantages stem from

the fact that the further you move the administration away from the source from which the service is being rendered the more difficult it is to render that service, and that is one of the thoughts we had in regard to disadvantages, and, true, we must accept that any controls taken away from either an agricultural organization or a broadcasting station or the daily press has some disadvantages, but I think generally speaking we accept these local personal or organizational disadvantages are in favour of the advantages.

MR. COYNE: You mean on balance?

MR. MARLER: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your next sentence is:

> "We also know, from experience, that there are disadvantages and abuses, and economic disaster resulting from uncontrolled developments through our free enterprise systems."

I think, having asked you to expand on one-half of your statement, perhaps we should ask you to expand on the other half.

MR. MARLER: What I pointed out here with respect to railways from Edmonton to way past Robson in the mountains, back in 1905 and 1909; in 1905 the Canadian Northern came through and in 1908/09 the Grand Trunk came through, and they built a line on through Edmonton. It was already coming as far as Edmonton; it didn't duplicate. However, from Edmonton west they went along with only the one

fence between them in most areas, and in those early days I don't know of anything more glaring from the point of view of waste and duplication, and it was created under free enterprise. I hardly think it should be charged to free enterprise, but it was done under free enterprise for the lack of final authority administering jurisdiction to curtail that sort of thing. I lived between these two lines and saw them both coming through. On the line west of Edmonton, the track of one has since been lifted since the Canadian National took over both lines. It was used by the Provincial Government as a highway. You would not recognize it as the bed of a railway, but when I used to go big game hunting back in 1928 we went over this bed with the ties and things still on it. So, that is one of the duplications that has been costly. That is another thing where free enterprise does not measure up, and I have used northern railways as an example, where it was built privately and fell under as an economic operation. No private railway company wanted to take this over and it fell to the hands of the Provincial Government at that time to take over this railway and operate it in order to maintain the service it was giving to the Peace River country and the residents in between. In the following years it was taken over by the C.P.R. and C.N.R. jointly to operate, and has worked out very well, I think.

Other abuses of free enterprise, I think, are present as a result of what can happen in a free

enterprise where a monopoly is created by one strong body getting the edge, and once the edge is there the distance is widened and results finally in squeezing another company out of the field and results, for example, in having complete monopoly of the daily press in this city and the area of all northern Alberta.

MR. COYNE: Turning to another subject, although perhaps related, on page 4 you are speaking of the proposal which has been put before this Commission that there should be a separate regulatory body with jurisdiction over both the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and the private stations, and you say:

> ". . . and that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation then would function under the controlled direction of this board, as would private companies, and would become merely a competing body in the broadcasting field."

Do you not think that it is a competing body now -- that is, is there not competition between the CBC and the private stations which exist?

MR. MARLER: I don't think there is sufficient competition in Alberta to properly say it is a competing body.

MR. COYNE: You don't think, for example, that in this city where there are, I think it is six stations, that the CBC competes with the private stations?

MR. MARLER: It does -- on radio you mean?

MR. COYNE: Oh, yes, radio.

MR. MARLER: It does on radio to some extent, but the competition is not as good as it should be because the receptability of the CBC station is much more limited than the engineers ever visualized it would be when they set it up. At my farm east of the city and in our office here in the city it was much more difficult to get clear reception from the CBC station at Lacombe than the other stations. The other stations give much better reception.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Marler, would it be a fair summary of the position that your organization takes, that you are in favour of the present system that has developed in respect of radio and that you recommend that a similar system -- I am speaking of the CBC with the private stations performing certain functions within the system -- that that same system should be developed in the television field?

MR. MARLER: I would say generally, yes, but always being ready to accept anything that merits consideration in the way of adjustments. I would say I think the private stations are operating under a healthy condition. I feel, when everything is considered, they have no reason to complain and I believe the people are enjoying, through the complementary local service that is given to us by the private stations, a better reception of radio than they would had that not been available.

(Page 2065 follows)

MR. COYNE: I notice you say on page 14 that the public generally seems to approve of the CBC, and you say:

> "And must feel that it is a happy medium between complete state control and operation on the one hand, and private operation and monopoly on the other."

MR. MARLER: That completely represents our opinion.

MR. COYNE: And you feel that those same conditions, by and large, should apply to the development of television as we have it in the development of radio?

MR. MARLER: Yes, with the control vested in CBC.

MR. COYNE: Now, just on page 14 in the final paragraph you point out that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is at a great disadvantage in respect to public relations, and I would like to ask you whether you feel that the CBC -- that it would be proper for the CBC to carry on an active public relations programme designed to defend the system that it is charged with operating?

MR. MARLER: No, I do not think it would be but I think it would be fair for the CBC to start a public relations programme to explain the services which they give, without either incurring favour or disfavour in respect to policy and that sort of thing. They are charged, as the Chairman I believe

pointed out this morning, to carry this programme out, instructed to do that.

MR. COYNE: In other words, what you have in mind is that the CBC should inform, better inform the public, as a matter of fact, on what they are doing?

MR. MARLER: That is right. We have the same case in respect to the Canadian Wheat Board; they are out there doing a job and they anticipate that the people know what they are doing, but I think it is up to them to let people know what the actual position is. It seems to me that in that case there are more people dissatisfied than satisfied.

MR. COYNE: Presuming a public relations programme of that kind would cost some money and it would presumably be public money, that does not introduce any objection in your mind?

MR. MARLER: Well, I think it would be wrong if it was not public money, because I do not think anyone else would pay for it unless it was favourable to them.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are really talking about a public information job rather than a public relationships job?

MR. MARLER: Yes, I think they are both the same, really.

MR. COYNE: Turning to page 15, about the middle of the page you are speaking of the question of private networks and you say:

> "No doubt it is anticipated that a private national network would evolve to compete with the Canadian

Broadcasting Corporation, creating unnecessary expensive duplication and competition."

The question I wanted to ask you was this, assuming that it was possible for the private unaffiliated stations to set up a network of their own, independent of the CBC and without any cost in public funds and without interfering with the CBC network and coverage would you have any objection in principle to them operating a private network if those circumstances applied?

MR. MARLER: Well, first, I think I would say it is wrong to assume because ---

MR. COYNE: I was making these assumptions and it may or may not turn out to be so.

MR. MARLER: I think we have to face facts, and I think on the contrary it is possible for private stations to set up a network just as it was possible for private industry to set up two railways side by side, but it turned out it was not the right thing to do.

THE CHAIRMAN: You mean the economy would not support it?

MR. MARLER: It just does not justify it, I do not think people are requesting it or demanding it nor do I think the people under such circumstances, having in mind the state of our economy, will get as good service under that set-up as it will under the basis we are developing under now.

MR. COYNE: It has been suggested to us by

some people that competition in this field should lead to an improvement of service and an improvement of programming.

MR. MARLER: I agree with that with certain limitations; I think competition is good in certain spots and with certain limitations, I think that with our private stations here in Edmonton, and I will cite one programme, Search for Talent -- this station goes out through the towns in the province and they hold a search for talent night. Mostly youths come to this town for this night and they compete with the semi-finalists and finals. I think the finals are just over or will be over this week. Now, I think that competition there is wonderful, and that the private station is making a great contribution to Canadian talent, to provincial talent, but when you take competition in the case of our press, again here in Edmonton, the competition led to complete monopoly of the press, the daily press.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: The competition you speak of is competition among private stations to try to get the balance in this particular case that you stated?

MR. MARLER: I think if you throw it wide open -- I was puzzled this morning by Mr. Taylor to know exactly what he was putting over, but at first thought it rather occurred to me that what his real thinking was, it should be thrown wide open, broadcasting should be thrown wide open for development. Well now, under such basis what would that lead to?

It would lead us to the survival of the fittest, it would eventually lead to one broadcasting station probably in Edmonton or it would lead to having a programme of entertainment and entertainment.

THE CHAIRMAN: On that same point Mr. Coyne was asking you about on page 15, just before the sentence he read to you, you say:

> "An independent authority would be impractical, unwise and much more expensive."

What is your thinking behind that?

MR. MARLER: Well, I point out in this brief the independent set-up that has been suggested time and time again in various forms, that is the Transport Board, and the fact that I do not know of any Board that has had more difficulties, has had more difficult problems and has had more dissatisfaction expressed by important organizations and governments and companies than what the Transport Board has, and my objection to that is, if you set up a separate entity, a controlling entity apart from the CBC then you immediately set the CBC up as a private government operating broadcasting organization competing with all the other developments of free enterprise and it will have to adopt, under competition, the same methods of doing business, of operating, as the other organizations will, and then you will have the broadcasting programmes lead back to what I said a moment ago, to entertainment and advertising.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does that tie back into

something on page 7 of your brief where you say:

"There are certain necessities in our way of living that are not inducive to free enterprise . . ."

MR. MARLER: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am trying to get at your thought, I am not trying to stop your thinking, but merely to find out what it is you are saying to us. Are you suggesting there are certain functions in Canada to be performed by a broadcasting system that is not responsible to the private enterprise?

MR. MARLER: Yes, and is not responsible to operate on a basis of revenue from advertising.

THE CHAIRMAN: What kind of thing have you in mind there when you say certain things are not inducive to free enterprise?

MR. MARLER: Well, I think that we can use broadcasting as an example. As I pointed out, I think if we give the people their choice, I think we should do so as far as possible; if we can give them their choice under private development or under a combination of the two developments with some other authority in control, I think we would lead to a programming mainly of entertainment and advertising. Now, when I appeared before the Massey Commission I used this illustration to illustrate the thinking of people; we have heard in this city and all the major cities across Canada a broadcast known as Class A Fare. There are thousands of people in there for five or six days a week, we have

agricultural exhibits, we have the midways, we have the horse races, machinery exhibits, art and so on, but where do the people go? They go to the horse races almost always; not all of them, of course, but a greater majority go to the horse races. Now, if we are going to hold these agricultural fairs on the basis of commercial considerations only without service to the people on the farm or in agriculture, better methods of operating, better methods of keeping homes, then we waive all these other considerations and concentrate on horse racing because that is the main revenue-earning thing.

(Page 2072 follows)

MR. COYNE: Turning to your final point, you say:

> "We have no recommendations to make in respect to financing, other than to say that we feel methods adopted thus far probably have been satisfactory. "

They have been unsatisfactory in this sense, that the revenues have been falling off and the methods are not producing enough funds. I wonder if you could tell us what you meant when you said the methods adopted thus far have been satisfactory?

MR. MARLER: I was speaking entirely from the listener's point of view.

MR. COYNE: Your organization is not putting forth any suggestion as to the method by which the CBC should be financed?

MR. MARLER: None, other than we think that it should not be dependent on earning revenue sufficient to carry out the services that it is charged to carry out, particularly to the extent that it is going to curtail those services and make it impossible for it to carry out that programme.

MR. COYNE: Have you given consideration to the proposition that television and radio as a service reaching certain people with receiving sets should be financed by the persons who benefit, namely the owners of receiving sets through some kind of licence fee?

MR. MARLER: Well, we have never objected

to a small licence fee. We did object to the licence fee being increased over the $2 or $2.50 for radio when the Massey Commission was here, and I don't think we would be critical of a small charge on TV sets.

MR. COYNE: A small charge in those terms probably would not be sufficient in itself.

MR. MARLER: I don't think so. I don't think it would be, and therefore I think that a considerable contribution to the financing of the CBC will have to come from the House of Commons and Federal treasury in order for them to do the job they are expected to do, because I think the very nature of their undertaking prohibits them from properly financing it on a commercial basis.

MR. COYNE: And you would assume that such funds would come out of the general tax funds?

MR. MARLER: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Those are all the questions I have.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: You have no particular objection to the present method of raising some of the funds through excise tax on radio and television sets and parts?

MR. MARLER: No, we haven't. We think, for a limited time at least, that has some commendable factors in it. So far it seems it has not curtailed the purchases of sets to any great extent. I know in the month of January there were approximately 52,000 TV sets purchased in

Canada.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Marler, I think there is only one point in your brief which at this moment I could completely and unequivocally agree with, and that is on page 8 where you say:

> "Regardless of what form of control is utilized, criticism will continue to be evident, and any idea of complete satisfaction tó all interested parties is an impossibility."

I do want to thank you very much for presenting this brief. We have completed the list for this afternoon and we are starting tomorrow morning, since we have to catch a train at noon, at nine-thirty with briefs from Stations CJCA and CFAC, if I have the stations right.

---The hearing adjourned at 4.40 p.m. until 9.30 a.m. tomorrow.

- - - - - -

I N D E X

May 22, 1956

SUBMISSIONS BY:	Page
ALBERTA MINISTRY OF TELEPHONES	1904
Hon. Gordon E. Taylor	
ALBERTA FEDERATION OF HOME AND SCHOOL ASSOCIATIONS	1960
Mrs. B.P. Marliss Mr. W.E. Hodgson	
THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA	1972
Miss M. MacKenzie Dr. Walter Johns	
FARMERS' UNION OF ALBERTA	1983
Mr. A.W. Platt Mrs. Olive Douglass	
RADIO-EDMONTON LIMITEE (CHFA)	2001
Dr. L.P. Mousseau M. Leo Remillard	
l'ASSOCIATION CANADIENNE-FRANCAISE de l'ALBERTA	2030
M. Andre Dechene	
ALBERTA PROVINCIAL COMMITTEE LABOUR-PROGRESSIVE PARTY	2041
Mr. W.A. Tuomi	
THE ALBERTA FEDERATION OF AGRICULTURE	2051
Mr. Roy Marler Mr. James McFall	

INDEX TO EXHIBITS

No.	Description	Page
80	Brief presented by the Honourable Gordon E. Taylor, Minister of Telephones, Province of Alberta	1904
81	Brief of Alberta Association of Home and School Associations	1960
82	Brief of University of Alberta	1972
83	Brief of Farmers' Union of Alberta	1983
84	Brief submitted by Radio-Edmonton Limitee	2001
85	Brief submitted by l'Association Canadienne-francaise de l'Alberta	2031
86	Brief of Alberta Provincial Committee, Labor-Progressive Party	2041
87	Brief of Alberta Federation of Agriculture	2051

HAND BOUND
BY
UNIVERSITY
OF TORONTO
PRESS